S·P·Q·R·ROMA·CAPVT·MVNDI

Property of
WILLIAM and FLORA RICHARDSON
LIBRARY

Michael Morris

# GREGOROVIUS'
# HISTORY OF THE CITY OF ROME
# IN THE MIDDLE AGES.
## VOL. II.

# CONTENTS.

## BOOK III.

FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE RULE OF THE EXARCHS TO THE BEGINNING OF THE EIGHTH CENTURY.

### CHAPTER I.

PAGE

1. Rome falls to Decay—Rise of the Church on the Ruins of the Empire—S. Benedict—Subiaco and Monte Casino—Cassiodorus becomes a Monk—Beginning and Spread of Monasticism in Rome, . . . . . 1

2. Progress of the Lombards in Italy—They advance as far as Rome—Benedict I., 574—Pelagius II., 578—The Lombards Besiege the City—Destruction of Monte Casino, 580—Foundation of the First Benedictine Monastery in Rome—Pelagius II. Implores Aid from Byzantium—Gregory, Nuncio at the Imperial Court—Inundation and Pestilence of 590—Death of Pelagius II.—His Building of S. Lorenzo, . . . . . 16

3. Election of Gregory I.—His Past—Penitential Procession—Legend of the Appearance of the Archangel Michael over Hadrian's Mausoleum, . . . . . 30

### CHAPTER II.

1. Gregory consecrated Pope—His First Sermon — Rome harassed by the Lombards—Gregory pronounces her Funeral Oration—Purchases the Withdrawal of the Lombards, . . . . . 35

PAGE

2. Condition of the Temporal Government of Rome—The Imperial Officials—Silence regarding the Senate, . 46

3. Gregory's Attitude with Regard to the City—His Care for the People—Administration of the Ecclesiastical Property, . . . . . 54

4. Gregory makes Peace with Agilulf—Phocas Ascends the Throne of Byzantium and Receives Gregory's Congratulations—His Column in the Roman Forum, . . 62

## CHAPTER III.

1. Character of the Sixth Century—Mohammed and Gregory—Religious Conditions of the Time—Worship of Relics—Belief in Miracles—Gregory Consecrates the Gothic Church of S. Agatha in the Subura, . . . 70

2. Gregory's *Dialogues*—Legend concerning Trajan—The Forum Trajanum—State of Learning—Accusations against Gregory—Increasing Ruin of the City—Gregory Attempts to Restore the Aqueducts, . . . 80

3. Gregory's Activity in Ecclesiastical Affairs—His Efforts to Unite the German West with Rome—Conversion of England—Death of the Pope, 604—His Monuments in Rome, . . . . . 96

## CHAPTER IV.

1. Pontificate and Death of Sabinian and Boniface III.—Boniface IV.—Dedication of the Pantheon to the Virgin, . 104

2. Deusdedit Pope, 615—Revolts in Ravenna and Naples—Earthquakes and Leprosy in Rome—Rebellion of the Exarch Eleutherius in Ravenna—Boniface V. Pope—Honorius I., 625—Right of Confirming the Papal Elections devolves on the Exarch—Buildings of Honorius—S. Peter's—Spoliation of the Roof of the Temple of Venus and Rome—Chapel of S. Apollinaris—S. Adriano in the Forum, . . . . . 113

PAGE

3. S. Theodore by the Palatine—Ancient Associations—The Church *SS. Quatuor Coronatorum* on the Coelian—S. Lucia *in Selce*—S. Agnese outside the Porta Nomentana —SS. Vincenzo and Anastasio *ad Aquas Salvias*—S. Pancrazio, . . . . . 124

CHAPTER V.

1. Death of Honorius I., 638—The Chartular Maurice and the Exarch Isaac sack the Ecclesiastical Treasury—Severinus —John IV.—The Lateran Baptistery—Theodorus Pope, 642—Rebellion of Maurice in Rome—Death of the Exarch Isaac—Court Revolution in Byzantium—Constans II. Emperor—The Patriarch Pyrrhus in Rome—The Churches of S. Valentine and S. Euplus, . . 134

2. Martin I. Pope, 649—Roman Synod concerning the Monothelites — Design of the Exarch Olympius against Martin's life—Theodorus Kalliopa forcibly carries off the Pope, 653—Martin dies in Exile—Eugenius Pope, 654, . . . . . 144

3. Vitalian Pope, 657—The Emperor Constans II. visits Italy—His Reception and Sojourn in Rome, 663—A Lament over Rome—Condition of the City and its Monuments—The Colosseum—Sack under Constans—Death of the Emperor in Syracuse, . . . 150

CHAPTER VI.

1. Adeodatus Pope, 672—Restoration of the Monastery of S. Erasmus—Donus Pope, 676—Agathon Pope, 678—The Archbishop of Ravenna makes Submission to Rome—The Sixth Oecumenical Council—The Pestilence of 680—S. Sebastian—S. George—The Basilica *in Velo Aureo*, . . . . . 163

2. Leo II., 682—Benedict II.—Conditions of the Papal Elections—John V.—Factions at the Election of his Successor—Conon—Clergy, Army, and People—Sergius I.—The Exarch Platina comes to Rome, 687, . . 173

3. Sergius Rejects the Articles of the Trullan Synod—Arrival of the Spathar Zacharias to depose the Pope—Entrance of the Ravennese—Relations of Ravenna to Rome and Byzantium—Johannicius of Ravenna, . . . . PAGE 181

## CHAPTER VII.

1. S. Peter's—Pilgrimages to Rome—Cadwalla receives Baptism, 689—Conrad and Offa take the Cowl—Sergius adorns the Churches with Offerings—Tomb of Leo I. in S. Peter's, . . . . . 186

2. John VI., 701—The Exarch Theophylactus comes to Rome—The Italian Militia advances before the City—Restoration of the Abbey of Farfa—Gisulf II. of Benevento invades the Campagna—John VII., 705—Justinian II. reascends the Byzantine Throne—John VII.'s Oratory in S. Peter's—S. Veronica's Handkerchief—Subiaco restored, . . . . . 192

3. Sisinnius, 707—Constantinus, 708—Punishment inflicted on Ravenna—The Pope journeys to the East—Executions in Rome—Revolt under George in Ravenna—First Confederation of Italian Cities—Philippicus Bardanes Emperor, 711—The Romans refuse their Allegiance—The Roman Duke and Duchy—Civil War in Rome—The Palace of the Caesars—Anastasius II. Emperor, 713—Death of Constantine, 715, . . . 201

---

# BOOK IV.

FROM THE PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY II. (715) TO THE CORONATION OF CHARLES AS EMPEROR (800).

## CHAPTER I.

1. Pontificate of Gregory II., 715—His Activity—Conversion of Germany by Boniface—Leo the Isaurian—Image-worship—The Bronze Statue of S. Peter in the Vatican, 217

PAGE

2. Leo's Edict against Image-worship—Resistance in Rome and Italy—Plot against Gregory's Life—The Romans and Lombards rise in Arms—Revolt against Byzantium —Gregory's Letters to the Emperor, . . . 227

3. Attitude of Liutprand—He Conquers Ravenna—Presents Sutri to the Pope—The Pope, the Venetians and Greeks form a League against him—The King advances against Rome and retires—A Usurper in Tuscany—Death of Gregory II., 731—Gregory III.—Roman Synod convened against the Iconoclasts—Art in the West—Buildings of Gregory III.—Restoration of the City Walls, . . . . . 237

4. Leo the Isaurian sends a Fleet against Italy—He confiscates Property belonging to the Roman Church—The Pope acquires Gallese—Enters into Alliance with Spoleto and Benevento—Liutprand invades the Duchy—Gregory turns to Charles Martel—Deaths of Gregory III., Charles Martel and Leo the Isaurian, 741, . . . 248

## CHAPTER II.

1. Zacharias Pope, 741—He holds Negotiations with Liutprand —Journeys to meet him—New Lombard Donation to the Church—Second Journey of the Pope to Liutprand —Death of the King—Rachis succeeds to the Throne of Pavia, . . . . . 257

2. Continued Recognition of the Emperor—Peaceful Relations with Byzantium—Carloman takes the Cowl—Rachis follows his Example—Astolf King of the Lombards, 749 —Pipin's Usurpation recognised by the Pope—Death of Zacharias, 752—His Buildings at the Lateran—The *Domus Cultae*, . . . . . 262

3. Stephen II. Pope—Astolf conquers Ravenna, 751—Stephen seeks Aid from the Emperor, afterwards from Pipin—Journeys to France—Consecration of Pipin and his Sons, 754—Defensive Treaty of Kiersey—Pipin appointed Patricius of the Romans, . . . 274

PAGE

4. Fruitless Negotiations with Astolf—Stephen's return—Pipin comes to Italy—Astolf accepts the proffered Peace—Pipin's first Deed of Gift, 754—The Lombard King enters the Duchy—Siege of Rome, 756—Devastation of the Campagna—Sack of the Roman Catacombs—Stephen's Letter to the Franks—S. Peter's to the Kings of the Franks, . . . . . 287

5. Pipin comes to Italy—Astolf raises the Siege of Rome—Arrival of the Byzantine Envoys—Their Disillusion—Submission of Astolf—Pipin's Deed of Gift—Foundation of the State of the Church—Death of Astolf, 756—Desiderius recognised King of the Lombards—Death of Stephen, 757, . . . . . 295

## CHAPTER III.

1. Paul I., 757—Letters of the Romans to Pipin—Friendly Relations of the Pope to the King—Desiderius punishes the Rebellious Dukes of Spoleto and Beneventum—Comes to Rome—Paul's Political Dealings—Relations of the Pope and the City to Byzantium—Peace with Desiderius, . . . . . 307

2. Buildings of Stephen II. and Paul I.—The Vatican and S. Peter's—The first Belfry in Rome—The Chapel of S. Petronilla—Removal of the Saint from the Catacombs to the City—Foundation of the Convent of S. Silvestro in Capite, . . . . . 316

3. Death of Paul I., 767—Usurpation of the Dux Toto—The Pseudo-Pope Constantine—Counter-revolution in Rome—Christophorus and Sergius, with the aid of the Lombards, surprise the City—The Lombards install Philip in the Lateran—Stephen III.—Terrorism in Rome—Punishment of the Usurpers—Death of Pipin, 768—Lateran Council, 769, . . . . . 322

## CHAPTER IV.

PAGE

1. Power of Christophorus and Sergius in Rome—Stephen forms an Alliance with Desiderius—The King of the Lombards advances before the City—Fall of Christophorus and Sergius—The Pope's Share in their tragic end—Project of double Marriage-Alliance between the Houses of Pavia and France—Counter-Intrigues of the Pope—Resistance of Ravenna—The Frankish Policy turns in favour of the Pope—Death of Stephen III., 772, 334

2. Adrian I.—Overthrow of the Lombard Party in Rome—Hostile advance of Desiderius—Fall of Paul Afiarta—The City Prefect—Desiderius lays waste the Roman Duchy—Adrian prepares for defence—Retreat of the Lombards, . . . . . 345

3. Charles's Expedition to Italy—Siege of Pavia—He celebrates Easter in Rome—Confirms Pipin's Donation—Fall of Pavia and the Lombard Kingdom, 774, . . 352

4. Constantine's Donation—Geographical Limits of the Caroline Donation: Spoleto; Tuscany; the Sabina; Ravenna—Charles claims the Right of Confirming the Archbishops of Ravenna—The Patriciate of S. Peter—Evidence that the Pope submitted to Charles's Supremacy—Traffic in Slaves among the Greeks and Venetians, . . 361

5. Benevento—Arichis attains Independence—Papal War on account of Terracina—Charles's Second and Third Visits to Rome—Expedition against Benevento—Conclusion of Peace—Fresh Donation to the Church—Arichis negotiates with Byzantium—Byzantium affairs—Settlement of the Iconoclastic Dispute—Grimoald, Duke of Benevento, . . . . . 376

## CHAPTER V.

1. Condition of the City—Inundation of the Tiber in 791—Adrian restores the Walls of the City, the Aqua Trajana, the Claudia, Jovia, and Aqua Virgo—Foundation of Colonies in the Campagna—Position of the Coloni—Adrian's *Domus Cultae*—Capracorum, . . . 385

PAGE

2. Adrian's Ecclesiastical Buildings—Portico of the Vatican—S. Peter's—The Lateran—S. Paul's—Activity of Art in Rome—S. Giovanni *ante Portam Latinam*—S. Maria *in Cosmedin*—The *Schola Graeca*—Monte Testaccio, . 398

3. Condition of Learning in the time of Adrian—Ignorance of the Romans—Culture of the Lombards—Adalberga—Paulus Diaconus—Schools in Rome—Sacred Music—Disappearance of Poetry—Epitaphs—Decadence of the Latin Tongue—Rise of the new Roman Tongue, . 410

## CHAPTER VI.

1. Internal Condition of Rome and the Roman People—The Three Classes—Organisation of the Militia—The *Exercitus Romanus*—The System of Scholae—Universal Character of the Corporation System—Scholae of Foreigners: Jews, Greeks, Saxons, Franks, Lombards, Frisians, . . . . . 420

2. Civil Administration of the City—Non-existence of the Senate—The Consuls—The City Officials—The Nobility—Administration of Justice—The City Prefect—The Papal Court—The seven Ministers and other Officials of the Papal Palace, . . . . . 431

3. Institutions in other Cities—Duces, Tribuni, Comites—The Ducatus Romanus and its Frontiers—Roman Tuscany—Campania—Sabina—Umbria, . . . . 448

## CHAPTER VII.

1. Death of Adrian, 795—Leo III. Pope—His Embassy to Charles—Charles's Treaty with the Church—Symbolical Significance of the Keys of the Apostle's Grave and the Roman Banner—Supreme Jurisdiction exercised by Charles as Patricius—Representation of the Harmony between the Spiritual and Temporal Power—Mosaics in S. Susanna, and in the Triclinium of Leo III., . 462

2. Conspiracy of Adrian's Nephews and other Aristocrats against Leo III.—Attempt upon the Life of the Pope—His Flight to Spoleto, Journey to Germany, and Meeting with Charles—Rome in the Power of the Nobility—Alcuin's Advice to Charles—Leo's return to Rome, 799—Charles, through his Envoys, takes Proceedings against the Accused, . . . . . PAGE 479

3. Charles's Journey to Rome—Parliament in S. Peter's—His Sentence on the Romans and the Pope—Leo's Oath of Purgation—Charles elected Emperor by the Romans—Restoration of the Western Empire—Charles the Great crowned Emperor by the Pope, 800—Opinions concerning the Legal Origin and the Conception of the new Imperium, . . . . . 491

INDEX, . . . . . 513

# BOOK THIRD.

FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE RULE OF THE EXARCHS TO THE BEGINNING OF THE EIGHTH CENTURY.

# HISTORY OF THE CITY OF ROME IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

## CHAPTER I.

1. Rome falls to Decay—Rise of the Church on the Ruins of the Empire—S. Benedict—Subiaco and Monte Casino—Cassiodorus becomes a Monk—Beginning and Spread of Monasticism in Rome.

With the overthrow of the Gothic kingdom begins the ruin of the Italy and Rome of antiquity. The laws, the monuments, even the historic recollections of the past fade from memory. The temples fall to ruin. The Capitol, standing on its desolate hill, it is true, still displays the sumptuous monuments of the greatest Empire ever known to history. But the Imperial Palace, although enduring in its main outlines, a colossal labyrinth of halls and courts, of temples and a thousand artistic chambers resplendent with precious marbles, and still here and there covered with gold-embroidered hangings, is but a haunted and deserted fortress. One little corner alone remains inhabited by the Byzantine Dux, a

Ruin of the city.

eunuch from the court of the Greek Emperor, or a half-Asiatic general, with his secretaries, servants and guards. Utterly deserted, the sumptuous Forums of the Caesars and of the Roman people fall into the obscurity of legend. The theatres and the huge Circus Maximus, where the chariot-races, the cherished and last remaining amusement of the Romans, are no longer celebrated, become grass-grown and filled with rubbish. The Amphitheatre of Titus stands undestroyed, though robbed of its ornament. The vast Thermae of Imperial times, no longer supplied by any aqueduct, useless, forsaken, and already mantled with ivy, resemble ruined cities in their vastness and desertion. The costly marbles have already fallen, or been ruthlessly stripped from their walls, and the mosaic pavements grown loose and disjointed. Some ancient chairs of light or dark marble, and splendid baths of porphyry or oriental alabaster still remain in the beautifully painted halls, but one by one these too are, for the most part, carried away by the priests, to serve as episcopal chairs in the churches, as receptacles for the ashes of some saint, or as fonts in the baptisteries. A few, however, together with numerous statues, still remain unheeded, to be shattered and overthrown by falling masonry or buried for centuries in dust.

The mind is incapable of projecting itself back into the past, and realising what the Roman of the days of Narses must have felt as he wandered through the deserted city and beheld the world-famous monuments of antiquity, the innumerable

temples, triumphal arches, theatres, columns and statues falling to decay, or already levelled with the ground. Imagination may strive to depict the desolate aspect of the city after its momentous conquest by Totila, or in the early days of Byzantine dominion, when the scanty remnant of the populace, scourged by famine and pestilence, and menaced by the sword of the Lombard, seemed lost in the vast capital of the Caesars. Power, however, is denied us to realise a picture so dark and terrible. Rome suffered a metamorphosis and became transformed into a city of cloisters. The metropolis of the universe was converted into a spiritual city, in which priests and monks bore entire sway, built churches and convents with untiring zeal, and ruled the whole of civic life. The lay population of Rome, however, utterly degenerate, robbed of all political power, a mass of moral degradation, seemed to sleep the sleep of ages in the ruin of its great past until, in the eighth century, the voice of the Pope aroused it to a new energy.

The Pope had meanwhile raised the structure of the Roman hierarchy. The gradual growth and rise of the spiritual power upon the ruins of the ancient State, under conditions the most difficult, must ever excite the wonder of posterity as one of the greatest transformations in the record of history. To follow this transformation is the task of the ecclesiastical historian, not that of the annalist of the city. Let it suffice us to trace in outline the general progress of events.

The political life of Rome closes with the over-

throw of the Goths, who for a time upheld the institutions of the State. While continuing the history of the city, we now enter the period of her papal Middle Ages. While every civic impulse died away, the entire vitality which yet remained to the Romans was now exclusively directed towards the service of the Church. After the majesty of Rome had perished, she, the Church, stood vigorous and alone. She alone preserved the moral unity of Italy when the State had fallen asunder, and the fact invested her with an Imperial authority. The spiritual power planted its sacred banner on the ruins of antiquity, and entrenched itself behind the walls of Aurelian, the historic importance of which we have already noticed. Within these walls the Church preserved the Latin idea of the monarchy, Roman civil law and the traditions of ancient culture. From here she undertook the great struggle with the barbarians who had overthrown the great Empire. She civilised them through Christianity, and made them subject to the Canon of Ecclesiastical Law. The task of civilisation would have been impossible had the Germans who ruled in Italy conquered the city. They attacked and besieged her repeatedly, but the preservation of Rome seemed a law of history. Even the Italian conquests of the Lombards, which threatened the overthrow of the Roman Church, in the end aided her triumphs. They weakened the power of the Byzantines, who resisted them for more than two hundred years in Ravenna. They forced the Roman bishops to put forth all their energies in the exercise of an inde-

pendent policy, a policy to which the Papacy owed the powerful position to which it gradually attained. These conquests further revived the national feeling of the Roman people, summoning them out of their deepest apathy to armed self-defence. The Roman Church was soon able to Catholicise the Lombards, and, resting on secure foundations and defended by Italy, to engage in a dogmatic struggle with Byzantium, a struggle which became a political revolution, and from which she issued a rich temporal power and mistress of the Eternal City. The result of the long conflict of the Popes with the Lombards, as also of that with Greek absolutism, was, that absolutism was rejected by Europe, that the Church obtained freedom for herself, and that the Western Empire appeared in the form of a feudal Christian Empire, the creation of the United Latin and German nations.

S. Benedict.

In the midst of the ruin into which Empire and city had fallen, arose, in the last days of the Gothic period, the solemn figure of a Latin saint, a man whose character reflected the period of transition to which he belonged, and whose life and works inaugurate the dark centuries we have now to depict. This memorable man was Benedict, son of Euprobus, born in Umbrian Nursia about the year 480, the patriarch of Western monasticism. As a boy of fourteen he came to Rome to complete his education, and the little church in the Trastevere, of S. Benedetto in Piscinula, is still pointed out as the spot occupied by the house of his wealthy parents. Amid the horrors of the decaying State, the youth was seized

with the irresistible desire to fly and dedicate himself in solitude to the contemplation of the Eternal. He escaped to Sublacus, where the Anio flows through one of the loveliest valleys of Italy.[1] Here he retired to a cave, while Romanus, an anchorite, provided him with food. The fame of his sanctity spread. Like-minded fugitives from the world gathered round him, and in a short time he was able to build twelve little convents in the neighbouring mountains. Here he dwelt several years, cheered by the encouragement of his sister Scholastica, and occupied with the establishment of his order. Even powerful patricians sought him out, bringing their children to him to be educated. The Senator Equitius brought his son Maurus, Tertullus his son Placidus, and, in these two pupils, Benedict trained the future apostles of Gaul and Sicily. The fame of the founder of the order excited, however, the envy of the priests in Varia or Vicovaro. They swore to drive away the saint, and legend relates that when one day they brought seven beautiful *hetaerae* to the convent, one of the saint's pupils yielded to temptation. Benedict resolved to leave the now desecrated Subiaco. Accompanied by three ravens, and guided on his way by angels, he wandered until he reached the mountain of Castrum Casinum in Campania. Here he found Paganism still existing; the laws of the last

He founds the monastery of Subiaco.

[1] Sublacus, or Sublaqueum, receives its name from some lakes which Nero had had constructed there for the adornment of his villa. The earliest mention of the site is in Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*, iii. 17. It was to the foundation of the monastery, however, that the *Castrum Sublacum* owed its origin. Nibby, *Anal.*, iii. 120, and Jannucelli, *Memorie di Subiaco*, Genoa, 1856.

Emperors having been of so little avail in uprooting the ancient faith, that Theodoric himself had been obliged to issue an edict against the worshippers of the gods. No sooner had Benedict arrived in Casinum than he overthrew the altars of Paganism and destroyed the last temple to Apollo of which history speaks. From its ruins he built a convent, undismayed by the demon, who, sitting on one of the prostrate columns, sought to hinder the work. This convent, the later Abbey of Monte Casino, became in the course of time the honoured metropolis of all the Benedictine monasteries of the West; and, throughout the darkness of the Middle Ages, this solitary watch-tower of learning survived to lighten with its beneficent rays the universal gloom. A breath of the Muses from the ruined Temple of Apollo had been preserved in this academy of praying and, at the same time, studying monks.[1] Its foundation by Benedict coincides, curiously enough, with the banishment of the last philosophers of the Platonic School from Athens by Justinian, which took place in the same year (529).[2]

Building of Monte Casino.

[1] Luigi Tosti, *Storia della Badia di Monte Casino* (Napoli, 1842, 3 vol.). The present of 7000 slaves in Sicily, together with Messina and Panormus, alleged to have been bestowed on Benedict by Tertullus, is a palpable absurdity. Tosti admits that the deed of gift bears the character of the tenth century, and the Privilegium of Pope Zacharias, in which the donation is ratified, exists only in copies since the eleventh. Sicily, to which Benedict sent Placidus as missionary, is the Paradise of the Benedictines; the fictitious document is forthcoming in the *Sicilia Sacra* of Pirro (p. 1155).

[2] The last seven sages of Athens were Damascius, Simplicius, Eulamius, Priscianus, Hermias, Diogenes, Isidorus. They fled as exiles to the court of Chosroes, King of Persia. Agathias, *Hist.*, ii. 30.

Here it was that the hero Totila visited the saint, whom he had vainly hoped to delude by a disguise, and from whose mouth he learnt his fate by a prophecy. Here Benedict uttered his prediction of the destruction of Rome by the elements, and later writers have quoted his prophecy with the object of exonerating the Goths from the odious accusations which have been heaped upon them. Here the sainted patriarch died about the year 544, soon after the death of his pious sister. The memorable life of the father of Western monasticism has been adorned by time with various poetic legends, which painters of mediaeval days have sought to depict in numerous frescoes in the upper church of Subiaco. These paintings are characterised by grace and purity of imagination, and, free from the harshness of the martyr histories as from the folly of later legends, may be termed the true epic of monasticism. Pope Gregory, a younger contemporary of Benedict, dedicated the second book of his dialogues to the legendary history of the saint, and, more than two hundred years later, the Lombard Warnefried, or Paulus Diaconus, as a monk of Monte Casino, made expiation for the sin of his people, who had previously laid waste the monastery, in the artistic couplets in which he glorified the miracles of Benedict.[1]

[1] Montfaucon, *Diarium Ital.*, p. 323, from a *Cod. Casin.*, saec. xi., gives portraits of Benedict, and illustrations of the ancient habit of the Benedictines; so, too, Tosti, I. 100, where we also find the rule of Benedict, according to the Commentary of Paulus Diaconus. For the history of Benedict, see Dacherii et Mabillonii, *Acta Sanctor. Ord. S. Bened.*, and Mabillon's *Annales Ord. S. Benedicti.*

At a time when the political order of the Roman Empire was dissolved, when civic society had fallen asunder, and many, following a natural impulse, sought refuge in solitude, this extraordinary man arose and constituted himself a law-giver in the sphere of Christian life and feeling. Monks, it is true, already existed in the West before the time of Benedict. They were, however, for the most part errant and undisciplined, living according to the rules of the Greek Basilius, of Equitius of Valeria, of Honoratus of Fundi, or Hegesippus of Castellum Luccullanum in Naples. Benedict now appeared to institute a reform of a Roman order, and give a permanent form to monasticism. Through him the Latin Church received her first independent cloistral organisation, and therewith emancipated herself from the influence of the East. Benedict thus acquired an entirely national importance for Rome and the Western world.

In judging monasticism from the standpoint of our present social life we cannot possibly do justice to a man such as Benedict; but if we seek to estimate it according to the requirements of his time, he must appear one of the greatest figures of the early Middle Ages, the Pythagoras of which he was. Before each of these law-givers hovered a social ideal: that of the renowned Greek to be realised in a brotherhood of free and philosophic men, actively fulfilling all the duties of life in the family and the State. The monastic republic of Benedict had, on the contrary, the narrowest social boundaries, and could therefore only be realised at the expense of civic society.

Adopting in his rules the Christian ideas of the denial of the State, and renouncing marriage, he created a brotherhood of anchorites. His societies, small in number, at first led isolated lives amid the solitude of the mountains, but later also dwelt apart in cities. Freedom from the world appeared only in the painful form of servitude, since those who enjoyed it were the vowed slaves of the Lord. The problem whether it were possible to establish the kingdom of Heaven on earth was to be solved in cloistered communities, but nature asserted her claims, and in the course of time these democracies of saints degenerated into a mere caricature. The frightful restraints imposed upon men to whom a merely mystical liberty is conceded, and who are excluded alike from the struggle with the passions of the world and the enjoyments of its riches are indeed tremendous. To submit to such restraints may not be beyond the power of the human constitution, but to impose them is certainly beyond the design of nature. And the more loveless, the more unhappy, the more confined society is, the more numerous will they be, who, willingly or under compulsion, renounce a vicious world and fly to the ideals of an inward longing.[1] The high-minded Benedict collected within his republic of holy men all the religious

[1] Nobler spirits did this actually from the impulse of which the poet speaks :—

Cast aside the slough of mortal clay
And from close dull life to the dominion
Of the Ideal flee away !

So, too, over the door of the convent of Grotta Ferrata are inscribed the words : *ἔξω γένοισθε τῆς μέθης τῶν φροντίδων.*

energies of that evil time, and as a law-giver gave them shape. It was his desire to realise the Christian theory of obedience to the moral law, to put in practice the teachings of humility and love, of self-renunciation and moral freedom, and finally to establish a communion of property. The greatness of his order consists in his having shown that these principles are not vain ideals, but can be truly carried out; and, if we desire to pay a well-deserved tribute to his system, we may say that in a barbarous age, when brutal egoistic passions governed mankind, it was able to oppose to them the example of a community of active self-denying men. Benedict did not allow his monks to dream away the time in idle contemplation; they must work, according to the social principle of the division of labour, with hand and head. The Benedictines became the teachers of agriculture, handicrafts, arts and learning in many countries of Europe; this order—the most praiseworthy of all the orders to which Christianity has given birth—thus conferring an everlasting service on mankind. From the time of its rise onwards it served as a place of refuge to society. The sons of rich and illustrious families entered its ranks, and, by the influence of its members, and still more by its pursuit of learning, it received an impress of no ordinary character. The Benedictines formed in truth the aristocracy of monasticism. The order spread rapidly over the West; Spain, Gaul, Italy, England, and, after the eighth century, Germany became filled by its monasteries. The Roman Church made use of them for her own aims; they

were for her what the military colonies had been for ancient Rome, and scarcely had the Empire fallen asunder when Roman monks, barefooted, the cord around their loins, fearlessly traversed as conquerors those districts of the Ultima Thule and the wild regions of the West which the consuls of old had but imperfectly vanquished at the head of their legions.

New convents sprang up at this period in every part of Italy. One we enter with the deepest reverence, for it is the last asylum of Cassiodorus. After having ruled Italy for thirty years under Theodoric, Amalasuntha, Athalaric and Vitiges, and having averted barbarism so long as he remained in power, weary of life and despairing of the world, the statesman withdrew from decaying Rome, to bury with himself the learning and political wisdom of antiquity in the monastic cell. In 538 he founded the *Monasterium Vivariense* in his native town, Squillace in Calabria, the charming situation of which he has himself described, likening it to a cluster of grapes hanging from the rocks. After having striven by his writings to impart a classical flavour to theology, he died, over a hundred years old, in 545; a contemporary of Boethius and Benedict,—men whom we only mention together in order to comprehend the contrasts offered by the time. Cassiodorus, the last Roman, lying down to die in the cowl of a monk, is a profoundly tragic figure, for in the statesman we see typified the fate of Rome herself.[1]

Cassiodorus embraces monasticism.

[1] Tiraboschi, iii. 1, c. 16, dating the decay of Latin literature from the time of Cassiodorus's retirement to the cloister, refutes with dignity

Several monasteries had meanwhile already arisen in Rome, for since Athanasius of Alexandria, the pupil of the Egyptian Anthony, in the middle of the fourth century, had introduced monasticism into the city, the system had spread with rapid strides. Even as early as the days of Rutilius, there was scarcely a little island in the Tyrrhenian Sea, such as Igilium Caprara or Gorgona, Palmara or Monte Cristo, where anchorites, "shunning the light," had not settled.[1] Augustine speaks of monasteries in Rome, and Jerome enumerates with satisfaction many monks and nuns. In a letter to Principia, a pious Roman lady, he gives some interesting particulars of the rise of the convent for women in the city. The foster-daughter of the celebrated Marcella had begged him for a sketch of a life of the matron, and Jerome knew not how better to honour the saint than in extolling her as the first nun of noble birth in Rome. Marcella, a member of a family which

Convents in Rome.

Marcella the first nun of noble birth in Rome.

St. Marc's suspicions with reference to the minister's motive for embracing the monastic life. During his sojourn in Squillace, Cassiodorus wrote his *Historiae ecclesiasticae tripartitae libri XII.*, an abstract from Sozomenus, Socrates and Theodoret; further, *de orthographia*, for the use of his monks, whom he enjoined to devote themselves to the writing of manuscripts. See Teuffel, *Geschichte der röm. Litteratur.*

[1] Rutilius (v. 439, *sq.*) makes the first satiric attack on monasticism with which we are acquainted in the elegant verses :—

*Processu pelagi jam se Capraria tollit.*
*Squallet lucifugis insula plena viris.*
*Ipsi se monachos graio cognomine dicunt,*
*Quod soli nullo vivere teste volunt.*
*Munera fortunae metuunt, dum damna verentur:*
*Quisquam sponte miser, ne miser esse queat?*

reckoned a long line of consuls and prefects among its ancestors, had lost her husband in the seventh month of her marriage, and, rejecting the advances of the Consul Cerealis, had chosen the religious life. With lofty courage she ignored the contempt with which women of position viewed a step hitherto unprecedented. Only a short time before Athanasius, and afterwards Peter of Alexandria, flying from the persecution of the Arians, had come to Rome. Their teachings, and the marvellous stories they related of the lives of Pachomius and Anthony, and the monks and nuns in the rocky deserts of the Thebaid, had fired the enthusiasm of Marcella, and in her zeal the pious widow would have had all the women in the city at once follow her example. Years passed, however, before her propaganda took effect, but at length she numbered with pride among her converts Sophronia, Paula and Eustochium. Finally, having made the acquaintance in Rome of S. Jerome, she henceforward maintained a lively correspondence with the saint. It is doubtful whether the first convent for women in Rome was founded by Marcella in her palace on the Aventine;[1] since at the beginning of her religious life she no longer dwelt in the city, but established her convent in one of her country seats, and there abode with her pupil Eustochium. "May you long live there," wrote Jerome; "through your example many are converted, and Rome, to our joy, has been transformed into

[1] Nerini, *de Templo et Coenob. S. Bonif. et Alexii*, Roma, 1752, c. 4, believes this convent on the Aventine to be the oldest convent in the city. The donation of Euphemius, however, provokes a smile.

Jerusalem; the convents of virgins are many, and innumerable the multitude of monks."[1]

Wherever there stood a church, a convent now arose beside it. Leo I. had already built a monastery close to S. Peter's and dedicated it to SS. John and Paul. The appearance of Benedict gave a new direction to the prevailing impulse. Rich patricians built or endowed convents. Gregory, a member of the celebrated family of the Anicii, spent the revenues of his house in founding a monastery within his ancestral palace on the Clivus Scauri. This building, which he dedicated to the Apostle Andrew, still exists close to the church of S. Gregory on the Coelian Hill.[2] At the time of his elevation to the Papacy, the company of monks and nuns, whether living together in cloisters or dwelling apart in cells, was so great that he reckoned no fewer than 3000 nuns who were in receipt of yearly allowances from the ecclesiastical treasury.[3]

[1] *Gaudeamus Romam factam Hierosolymam. Crebra virginum monasteria, monachorum innumerabilis multitudo* (S. Hieron., Ep. 126 ad Principiam). We saw Marcella with Principia on the Aventine during the Gothic sack; Marcella died a few days after the fall of the city. The earliest monumental mention of a nun in Rome belongs to the year 447: HIC QVIESCIT GAVDIOSA CF ANCILLA DEI QVAE VIXIT ANNIS XL ET MEN. V. DEP. X. KAL. OCTOB. CALLEPIO VC. CON. De Rossi, *Inscript. Christian.*, i. n. 739.

[2] Joh. Diacon., *Vita S. Gregor.*, i. c. 6; Paul. Diacon., *Vita S. Gregor.*, c. 2, in Mabillon, *Acta SS. Ord. S. Ben.*, i.

[3] Eighty pounds from "the patrimony of S. Peter," a sum which Gregory estimates as altogether insufficient during the prevailing distress. The lives of these women, he says, are passed in such tears and self-denial, that but for them none of us would have been able to survive under the swords of the Lombards for so many years. Letter to Theoktista and Andreas, Ep. 23, lib. vi. The nuns were called in Greek *monasteriae*, in Latin *sanctimoniales*.

2. The Lombards Advance into Italy—They Force their way to Rome—Benedict I., 574—Pelagius II., 578—The Lombards Besiege the City—Destruction of Monte Casino, 580—Foundation of the First Benedictine Monastery in Rome—Pelagius II. Implores Aid from Byzantium—Gregory, Nuncio at the Imperial Court—Inundation and Pestilence of 590—Death of Pelagius II.—His Building of S. Lorenzo.

The Lombards.

The monastic institution of Benedict, belonging as it does to the latest Gothic times, had arisen before the invasion of Alboin. In this institution the Church obtained one of the strongest weapons with which she was enabled to subdue the Lombards; foes who, at first sight, appeared so terrible. This rude people, of Arian faith, like the Goths, though mixed with the heathen races of Germany and Sarmatia, was incapable of receiving the ancient civilisation which it found in Italy otherwise than through the instrumentality of the Church.[1] The Latin Church, first subduing the invaders, gradually imparted to them the remains of the classical culture which had sought refuge within the cloister. More than 150 years were, however, required before the work of Lombard civilisation was accomplished, and

[1] The heathen customs of the Lombards have been described by Mone, *Gesch. des Heidenthums im nördl. Europa*, ii. 96. Borgia, *Memor. di Benevento*, ii. 277, cites a hymn to Barbatus of the year 667, the theme of which is the cessation of serpent-worship. From the belief of the Lombards in enchanted trees, the Italians credited the German nation with the worship of trees in general; a belief which Goethe discovered still existing in Italy.

this interval constituted one of the most terrible periods in the history of Italy. Her cities, in spite of having been devastated and depopulated by Attila and the Gothic wars, still preserved their Roman character and remained filled with the desolate monuments of past magnificence. One after another they now fell under the sword of the barbarian, and with the cities the remains of the ancient Latin municipal constitution also perished. Another spirit dwelt in the people of Alboin than in the followers of the great Theodoric; the Goths had protected Latin civilisation, the Lombards destroyed it. Meanwhile the new invaders filled a great void in Italy. Entering those districts which had been laid waste by war and pestilence, they colonised them anew, restored agriculture, and repopulated them. This new population, which in the course of time became Latinised, gave birth to those numerous families who for centuries ruled Italy from the banks of the Po to the southern recesses of the peninsula, and whose names have filled alike the annals of Church and State.

Milan had surrendered to Alboin in the autumn of 569, but not until after a three years' siege was he able (in 572) to enter the Palace of Theodoric in Pavia. Here from North Italy he undertook the subjugation of the entire peninsula. Rome, Ravenna, and the seaports alone upheld the banner of the Empire and Emperor. The preservation of the almost undefended capital appeared a miracle to the Romans themselves. Alboin had fixed his desires upon it, eager to make his dwelling in the palace of

the Caesars, and thence, like Theodoric, to rule the whole of Italy. His troops, marching from Spoleto and spreading terrible devastation by the way, already encamped before the walls of Aurelian.

John III., 560–573.

Meanwhile John III., under whose pontificate these events had taken place, died in July 573.

Rome had to face so many difficulties that S. Peter's chair was allowed to remain for more than a year unoccupied. The Lombards, lying before the gates or in the neighbourhood of the city, prevented all communication with Constantinople, whence the newly elected Pope had to receive the Imperial ratification.

Benedict I., 574–578.

A Roman, Benedict I., was now chosen to fill the vacant chair. The *Liber Pontificalis* informs us that during his reign the entire country was overrun by the Lombards, and that pestilence and famine annihilated the population. Rome was visited by both these scourges. The Emperor Justin, however, or the noble Tiberius, sent supplies of corn from Egypt to Portus, and strove to alleviate the distress in the city.

Kleph, on whom the Lombards had bestowed the crown of the murdered Alboin, dying in 575, the disordered kingdom was divided among thirty-six dukes, and at the time of Benedict's death (July 30, 578) Faroald, the first Duke of Spoleto, was engaged in laying siege to Rome.[1] The successor of

[1] The duchy of Spoleto was founded apparently about 569. See Fatteschi, who first made use of the Lombard documents of the Abbey of Farfa: *Memorie Istorico-Diplomatiche riguardanti la serie dei Duchi—di Spoleto*, Camerino, 1801. The chronology of early Lombard times remains obscure.

Benedict, Pelagius II., son of Vinigild, a Roman of Gothic descent, was therefore hurriedly consecrated on Nov. 27, without the Imperial ratification.[1] The difficulties in which the city found herself, and the absence of both Dux and Magister Militum, made the more necessary the hasty election of her spiritual head. We are ignorant of the means adopted by the inhabitants for their defence, nor do we know whether to the scanty Greek mercenaries who formed the garrison there was united a body of city militia. We have, however, grounds for believing that this siege gave rise to the first military organisation of the citizens. The Romans, who had once subdued the world by force of arms, returned in this later period of their historic life to their first beginnings, and, after a long and unparalleled interval of effeminacy, again undertook the formation of a small civic militia, as if destitute of any previous military traditions. Pelagius II., 578–590.

The afflicted city or her bishop, whom necessity had made her representative and was soon to make her ruler, turned to sue for help from the Byzantine Emperor. A solemn deputation of senators and priests, headed by the patrician Pamphronius, brought before the throne her entreaty and a sum of 3000 pounds in gold. The Persian war, however, demanded all the resources of the Empire, and the Emperor only sent an insufficient body of troops to Ravenna, a city, in his eyes, of more importance than Rome. He declined the gift of money, and advised its being used instead to bribe the Lombard

[1] The Goths had not entirely disappeared from Italy. In Rome, as on the Campagna, they survived in Latinised families.

King.[1] The Romans formed a treaty with the enemy, by which they obtained their ransom, and Zoto, Duke of Benevento, led his army back across the Liris.

The beautiful province of Campania was, however, called on to suffer the ravages of the merciless enemy. Aquino was burnt, and the monastery of Monte Casino reduced to ruins.[2] Zoto attacked it in the night; the unfortunate monks, however, found time to escape, and fled to Rome, bearing with them the book of the institution of their order, written by the hand of the saint.[3] Pelagius gave them shelter near the Lateran basilica, and here they founded the first Benedictine monastery within the city. This they dedicated to the Evangelist and the Baptist, and, as they later undertook the liturgical services in the basilica, the church of Constantine received from the adjoining monastery the title of S. John the Baptist. Valentinian was elected the first abbot, and while Monte Casino lay in ruins for a period of 140 years, the monastery beside the Lateran attained its zenith. Later it fell to decay, and in the eighth century Gregory II. found it necessary to restore it.[4]

First Benedictine monastery in Rome.

[1] Menander, *Excerpt.*, p. 126.

[2] Mabillon, *Annal. Benedict. ad Ann.* 580; Tosti accepts the year 589. I have followed the *Annals* of Mabillon and the *Acta SS. Ordinis S. Benedicti*, edited by him. Hirsch, *Das Herzogthum Benevent* (1871), p. 4, places the destruction of the monastery about the year 577.

[3] Paul. Diacon., iv. c. 17; "Chronicon S. Monast. Casin.," 1, c. 2, in Muratori, *Script.*, t. iv.

[4] In the later Middle Ages every trace of this monastery disappeared.

Even before the time that the fugitive Benedictines gained admission to the city, Gregory, one of her most respected patricians, had founded a monastery on the Coelian Hill. Pelagius, recognising in Gregory the man of the future, drew him out of his solitude and sent him as Nuncio to the Byzantine court, which the Pope wished to appease with regard to his ordination, as yet unratified by Imperial consent. The Roman Church had itself represented by an Apocrisarius or permanent ambassador, not only at Ravenna with the Exarch, but also at Byzantium with the Emperor. This is the first institution of a Nuncio, a post which, as we have already seen, was usually regarded as the last step to the chair of Peter. Gregory went to Constantinople, accompanied apparently by the same deputation as, in 579, had gone to demand aid against the Lombards. Arrived at the capital of the East, Gregory won for himself influential friends, both at the court and among the leading nobility; among them the Empress Constantina, the daughter of Tiberius; Theoktista, the sister of Maurice; and Maurice himself, who in August 582 ascended the Imperial throne.

Gregory, Nuncio in Byzantium.

That Gregory was still in Constantinople in 584 is proved by a memorable letter addressed to him by Pope Pelagius. Maurice, implored by the Nuncio to relieve Rome in her distress, finally sent—there being no Imperial general at the time in the city—the Dux Gregory and the Magister Militum Castorius, and Rome was temporarily freed from the enemy by a three years' truce. The treaty was concluded in 584

by Smaragdus, successor to Longinus in the Exarchate, with King Autharis, who had again united the Lombard kingdom.[1] The truce was, however, immediately broken, and Pelagius wrote to Gregory requiring him, in common with Bishop Sebastian, the bearer of the petition to Constantinople, to demand speedy help from the Emperor. "Speak therefore," wrote Pelagius, "and discuss together that you may come as quickly as possible to relieve our distress, for the republic is harassed by such difficulties that our ruin seems inevitable, unless God move the heart of the most pious Emperor to have pity upon his servants and graciously to give us a Dux and a Magister Militum to rule over the territory.[2] The Roman district, more than any other, seems bereft of a garrison, and the Exarch writes that he cannot help us, lamenting that he is unable adequately to defend his own immediate territory. May God therefore prompt the Emperor, and that quickly, to aid us in our danger, before the army of the godless people is in a position

[1] Sigon., *de Regno*, I, 17. Carlo Troya, *Cod. Dipl. Long.*, i. 62, believes that, in the absence of the Dux and Magister Militum, the city was governed by the Senate and the other authorities. Pelagius speaks of the peace, ii. Ep. v., to Elias, Bishop of Grado, and to the Bishops of Istria and Venetia (in Labbé, and in Troya's *Cod. Dipl.*, t. n. xiv.). Noris and Muratori are agreed in fixing the date in 586.

[2] *Respublica* here stands for the Empire. Thus King Childebert writes to Lawrence of Milan: *juxta votum Romanae reipubl. vel Sacrat. nostri Imperatoris* (Troya, *Cod. Dipl.*, i. n. xi.). *Vel unum magistrum militum, et unum ducem dignetur concedere*—the two offices were distinct. The letter to the Deacon Gregory in Mansi, ix. 889; Jaffé, *Reg. Pont.*, 2nd ed., n. 1052.

to seize those cities which the republic still retains."[1]

The ancient capital of the Roman Empire at this time found herself, in truth, utterly abandoned. The Greek Emperors, occupied by the migrations of the Slav tribes on the banks of the Danube, by the Persians in the East, and revolutions at home, left Italy to her fate. The Roman bishop on this account already began to turn his eyes to the West, where, in 486, Chlodwig had succeeded in founding the powerful kingdom of the Franks on the ruins of the Empire in Gaul. The Franks had acknowledged the orthodox Catholic faith from the time of their conversion. In them the Pope therefore saw the future defenders of the Church, and the priests had already bestowed on Chlodwig the title of "Most Christian King" and the "second Constantine." A memorable letter, written by Pelagius II. to Aunachar, Bishop of Auxerre, had already expressed the clear conviction that the orthodox Franks had been called by Providence to save Rome from the hands of the Lombards.[2] In fact the Emperor Maurice also stood in active negotiation with Childebert, the Frankish King, with reference to an expedition against the Lombards, and in 584 Childebert ad-

[1] Letter (ad Gregorium Diacon., Ep. iii., Labbé, *Concil.*, vi. 623), dated 4 Non. Oct. ind. iii., which Muratori gives to the year 587; Troya, i. n. 16, however, to the 5th Oct. 585.

[2] Ep. iv. ad Aunacharium Episc. Autisiadorensem: *nec enim credimus—sine magna div. providentiae admiratione dispositum, quod vestri reges Romano imperio in orthodoxae fidei confessione sunt similes; nisi ut huic urbi, ex qua fuerat oriunda, vel universae Italiae finitimos, adjutoresque praestaret.* The Franks were regarded as *Leti* or con-

vanced with an army against Italy. He was, however, prevailed upon by Autharis to make peace and return.

Soon after 584 Gregory was recalled from his post in Byzantium, and his place filled by the Archdeacon Lawrence. He returned to his monastery on the Coelian, and there remained until summoned to ascend the chair of Peter.

The following years are hid in obscurity. The chronicles of the time, monosyllabic and dismal as itself, speak of nothing but the havoc worked by pestilence and the elements. Towards the end of the year 589, the Tiber, overflowing its banks, laid a part of the city under water, and destroyed several ancient temples and monuments, situated, we may suppose, in the Field of Mars. The honoured Bishop Gregory of Tours at this time sent a deacon to collect relics in

Inundation of the Tiber, 589.

federates of the Roman Empire. Troya (*Storia d'Italia*, i. 1308; *Tav. Chronol.*, p. 577) refers to the lines addressed by Sidonius to Eurich, King of the Visigoths:—

*Eorice, tuae manus rogantur,*
*Ut Martem validus per inquilinum*
*Defenset tenuem Garumna Tibrim.*

See in *Cod. Dipl. Long.*, n. 43, the letter of Maurice to Childebert, where the Emperor speaks of *priscam gentis Francor. et Ditionis Romanae unitatem.* Thus was foreshadowed the later time when a Pope said of Charles the Great: *cujus industria Romanor. Francorumque concorporavit imperium*—Sergius, in a document given in Maurisse, *Hist. de Metz.*, p. 190 (Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgesch.*, iii. 185). Pope Anastasius, in a letter congratulating Clovis (*Cludoeco*) on his conversion (in the year 497), had already given utterance to the hope that in him the Church would find protection. A. Thiel, *Ep. R. Pont. Genuïnae*, i. 624.

Rome, and the accounts given, with extraordinary additions, by this eye-witness on his return were afterwards embodied by the bishop in his history of the Franks. "The Tiber," he says, "overflowed the city to such an extent that the ancient buildings fell in, and the granaries of the Church were destroyed."[1]

Outbreak of pestilence, 590.

Still greater, however, was the havoc wrought by pestilence. Since the year 542, this frightful scourge (named by Latin writers *lues inguinaria*) had scarcely ceased its ravages over the various countries of Europe, and now broke out afresh in many places which, like Rome, had been visited by inundations in 590.[2] Arising in the marshes of the Egyptian Pelusium, the plague had suddenly appeared in Constantinople, and then, as usually seems to be the case in great national disasters, had followed in the track of war. Procopius and, after him, Paulus Diaconus have minutely described this terrible scourge, which, in the extent of its horrors and visitation, seems to have been unsurpassed by the Black Death of a later age.[3] Confined to no season and spreading without contact, it seized alike on men and animals. The frenzied imagination heard in

[1] Gregor. Turonen., *Hist. Francor.*, x. c. i. Following his authority, Joh. Diacon., *Vita S. Greg.*, i. c. 34, and Paul. Diacon., *Vita S. Greg.*, c. 3, and *de Gestis Lang.*, iii. c. 23. Alveri, *Roma in ogni stato*, i., with great audacity and frequent mistakes, gives the history of all the inundations and pestilences in the city from the time of its foundation to the year 1660.

[2] Gregory of Tours, x. c. i. ; Paul. Diacon., *de Gest. Lang.*, iii. c. 24. Marius of Avenche calls it also *variola*, *pustula*, and *glandula*.

[3] Procop., *de bello Persico*, ii. c. 22, 23; Paul. Diacon., *de Gest. Lang.*, iii. c. 24.

air the braying of trumpets, saw the mark of the destroying angel on houses, and stalking in the streets the demon of pestilence himself, or ghosts (*φάσματα δαιμόνων*) who imparted death to those they met by a blow. The consequences were not always immediate, but frequently followed in three days. The stricken died, overpowered by sleep or consumed by fever, and the bodies being opened disclosed the bowels covered with ulcers, and substances like charcoal within the tumours.

The same pestilence had already repeatedly visited Rome and Italy during and after the Gothic war, and having broken out afresh in January 590, appeared with such violence that it threatened to depopulate the city. Gregory, who mentions it in his writings, assures us that men with their own eyes beheld arrows shot down from Heaven apparently piercing their fellow-men. Fear gave birth to visions, an example of which, as quoted by Gregory, reads like a presentiment of Dante's Hell. The soul of a soldier, sick of the plague, was removed from the body to the lower world. Here he beheld a bridge over a black stream, on the further side of which lay beautiful flowery meads, filled with men in white raiment. The just were permitted to cross the bridge, but the wicked were hurled into the stream. The dreamer saw a cleric, Peter, lying under a heavy weight of iron on the ground, and while a foreign presbyter succeeded in crossing the bridge in safety, Stephen, a Roman, fell over, and

while angels strove to hold him back, demons sought to drag him below.[1]

S. Lorenzo beyond the walls a monument of Pelagius II.

Pelagius II. fell a victim to the plague, dying on February 8, 590. The celebrated Basilica of S. Lorenzo beyond the gate, rebuilt by him, remained a monument to the memory of the bishop who governed the Church through this period of terrible distress.[2] The grave of the martyr on the Ager Veranus had already been enclosed within a chapel by Sixtus III. in the fourth century. His fame waxed with time. Pilgrims streamed to his festival at the Catacombs of Hermes and Hippolytus, where houses for pilgrims and small basilicas had already arisen side by side. Next to Lawrence, Stephen, Archdeacon of the church of Jerusalem, as proto-martyr, was the object of peculiar veneration. Legend relates that Pelagius had brought his remains from Constantinople to Rome, and had caused them to be buried in the same coffin with those of his fellow-martyr. These two saints represent, as the principal figures in the diaconate, the sacerdotal order in the Roman mythology, while other saints belong to the order of noble warriors or to the ranks of the people. Pelagius now rebuilt and enlarged the church already existing over the grave of S. Lawrence, boasting, in the inscription over the triumphal arch, that he had accomplished

[1] Gregor., *Dial.*, iv. c. 36. A remarkable vision of Paradise and Purgatory is later found in the letter of S. Boniface of Mainz to the Domina Eadeburga. See Baronius, *Annal.*, ix. p. 11.

[2] *Hic fecit supra corpus b. Laur. mart. basil. a fundam. constructam, et tabulis argenteis exornavit sepulcrum ejus.* *Lib. Pont.* in Pelagio.

the work under the sword of the enemy (the Lombard). The inscription, which still remains, serves to recall one of the darkest periods in the city's history.[1]

The Arch of Pelagius unites the two parts of this remarkable basilica, evidently formed from the original chapel and a Galilee (ante-chapel) of a later date. The former, in which niches for graves and traces of ancient painting are still apparent, must originally have been built within the catacombs. It contains two rows of columns, one over the other. In the lower row the five pillars at each side and the two at the end of the choir are ancient and splendid, and their Corinthian or fantastic capitals, although differing in style, are one and all beautiful. Two of these capitals are ornamented with victories and armour. The architrave which they support is composed of antique fragments roughly pieced together, temples of the best Imperial times having been despoiled to provide the material. Pelagius apparently found the first row of columns already existing, and erected on their architrave the upper row of smaller

[1] *Praesule Pelagio martyr Laurentius olim*
*Templa sibi statuit tam pretiosa dari:*
*Mira fides! gladios hostiles inter et iras*
*Pontificem meritis haec celebrasse suis.*

The inscription (six couplets) is given in *Röm. Stadtbeschr.*, iii. 2, 314; Ciampini, *Vet. Mon.*, ii. c. 13. The association between Lawrence and Stephen is shown by a sentence of Leo I.: *a Solis ortu, usque ad occasum Leviticorum luminum coruscante fulgore, quam clarificata est Hierosolyma Stephano, tam illustris fieret Roma Laurentio. S. Leo Papa serm.* 83 *in festo S. Laur. M.*, p. 169 (Lugdun, 1700); in Fonseca, *de Basil. S. Laur. in Dam.*, c. 3, p. 137.

columns, since it would seem that the grave of the martyr at first existed in the form of a temple surrounded by a colonnade, and that the church raised on eleven steps was an addition of later date. The plan of the building shows that the martyr's grave was not originally enclosed within a basilica; it was probably in order to erect this that Pelagius built a porch, threw a triumphal arch over the high altar, and, constructing a raised choir out of the original colonnade, thus produced a presbytery. The inscription under the old mosaic, which speaks of the temple, appears to apply to this twofold building. Pelagius decorated the triumphal arch with mosaics, of which much of the original character has been sacrificed in restoration. Christ sits in black garments on a globe; in the left hand He holds a staff with the Cross, with uplifted right he bestows the benediction. Beside Him stand SS. Peter and Paul; close to S. Paul S. Stephen and S. Hippolytus; beside S. Peter S. Lawrence, who holds an open book, and seems to present Pelagius to the Saviour. The Pope is clad in white, is bareheaded, without a nimbus, and carries the model of the building in his hands. Lastly, at the two ends, are depicted the towns of Jerusalem and Bethlehem, resplendent in gold, according to the ancient manner of representation. S. Lawrence is not yet represented in the youthful and attractive form which the ecclesiastical art of later days attributed to this, its favourite saint, as also to S. Stephen.[1]

[1] The ancient couplet under the mosaic has been restored :—

*Martyrium flammis olim Levita subisti,*
*Jure tuis templis lux beneranda redit.*

### 3. Election of Gregory I.—His Past—Penitential Procession—Legend of the Archangel Michael appearing over Hadrian's Mausoleum.

Gregory I., 590–604.

On the death of Pelagius the unanimous choice of both clergy and people fell on Gregory, a man whose memory has ever been cherished as that of one of the greatest of Popes.[1] A member of the ancient house of the Anicii, the most illustrious family in Rome during the later days of the Empire, he was the grandson of Pope Felix and the son of Gordianus. His mother, Silvia, owned a palace beside S. Saba on the Aventine. Two of his aunts on his father's side, Tarsilla and Emiliana, had entered a convent; while Gordiana, the third sister, preferred the secular life. Gregory had grown up in the most terrible of times, when his native country was reduced to subjection by the Lombards; when the barbarians had appeared before the very gates of Rome, and the last remains of Latin civilisation had been annihilated in their wild thirst for destruction. Destined in youth for a political career, Gregory had acquired all the rhetorical and dialectic education which could be furnished by Rome, where, however, the schools once protected by Theodoric can scarcely still have existed. He filled the city Prefecture, an office which yet lingered on;[2] but what could a high-minded

[1] His life was written by Joh. Diacon., a contemporary of Anastasius Bibliothecarius, about the year 882. A monk in Monte Casino, and afterwards a deacon of the Roman Church, he compiled the work at the instance of John VIII. (Mabillon, *Acta S. O. S. Ben.*, i.) Paul. Diacon. also wrote a *Vita S. Gregorii*, which is, however, merely a compilation from the *Ecclesiastical History* of Bede, and Gregory's own works.

[2] Gregory says (Ep. 2, lib. iii.): *ego quoque tunc urbanam praefec-*

Roman effect in the State in a time such as this? to what post of honour could he rise in the republic? The highest aim which could allure a descendant of the Anicii was the bishop's chair. Repelled by the political circumstances of the time, Gregory, like Cassiodorus, sought refuge in the habit of monasticism. "The man who had formerly been accustomed to parade the city in splendid silken raiment, glittering with jewels, now dedicated himself to the service of the Lord in a mean cowl."[1] We have already heard how he spent his wealth in founding monasteries. Six he built in Sicily, a fact which proves that his family must have possessed considerable property on the island. Pelagius consecrated him deacon, and made him Nuncio at Constantinople, and Rome with unanimous voice now elected him Pope.[2]

No one seemed better qualified to guide the Church in her distress than the most eminent and benevolent citizen and former Prefect of Rome. The Pope designate, however, sought to escape his high calling, and by letter requested the Emperor Maurice (with whom he stood on friendly terms) not to ratify the election. The letters were, however, intercepted by Germanus, the City Prefect, and others, containing urgent entreaties that the Emperor would confirm the election, substituted in their stead. During the

*turam gerens*. There is, however, the reading *praeturam*, and neither in Gregory of Tours, Paul. Diacon., nor Bede (*Histor.*, ii. c. 1) is there any mention of the fact.

[1] Gregory of Tours, *Hist.*, x. c. 1.

[2] *Clerus, senatus, populusque Romanus*, says Joh. Diacon., *Vita*, i. c. 39, but the word Senate is here used merely to signify the nobles.

vacancy of the sacred chair the administration of the Church lay in the hands of the arch-presbyter, the arch-deacon and the primicerius of the notaries, but since before being consecrated Gregory commanded a delay of three days for penitential processions to invoke Heaven for deliverance from the pestilence, it would appear that on this occasion the duty of representing the bishop devolved on him alone. The plague still continued its ravages. Gregory, himself in the penitential sermon which he delivered in S. Sabina on the 29th August, asserted that the Romans died in great numbers, and that the houses remained desolate.[1]

Penitential procession

The procession was ordered in the following manner. The population was divided into seven groups, according to age and class. Each division assembled in a different church, and thence made a pilgrimage to one common goal, the Basilica of S. Maria (Maggiore). The clergy started from SS. Cosma and Damiano with the presbyters of the sixth region; the abbots and their monks from SS. Gervasius and Protasius (San Vitale) with the presbyters of the fourth region; the abbesses and all the nuns from SS. Marcellinus and Petrus with the clergy of the first region; all the children of Rome from SS. John and Paul on the Coelian with the presbyters of the second region; all the laity from S. Stephen on the Coelian with the presbyters of the seventh region; the widows from S. Euphemia with the presbyters of the fifth;[2] and lastly, all the married women from S. Clement's with the

[1] S. Gregor., Ep. 2, 1, xi.

[2] According to Martinelli, S. Euphemia stood on the Vicus Patricius not far from the Titulus Pudentis.

presbyters of the third region.[1] The whole population of Rome thus joined in penitential procession, and while they marched among the ruins of the deserted city, and made the air re-echo with their solemn chants, they seemed to bear the phantom of ancient Rome herself to the grave, and to celebrate the auguries of the dreary centuries which were now to follow. The procession of 590 may in truth be regarded as the beginning of Rome's Middle Ages.

Pestilence accompanied the procession. Men fell to the earth dead. A supernatural vision, however, put an end to both litany and plague. As Gregory, heading the train of penitents, reached the bridge on the way to S. Peter's, a heavenly vision greeted the eyes of the people. The Archangel Michael descended, and, hovering over Hadrian's mausoleum, placed a flaming sword in its sheath—a sign that the plague was stayed. As early as the tenth century the mausoleum received the name of S. Angelo, in memory of this beautiful legend. The chapel on its summit, however, dedicated to S. Michael, had been of earlier origin, having been built probably in the eighth century. The bronze figure of the Archangel sheathing his sword still hovers, with outstretched wings, over Hadrian's

Vision of the Archangel.

[1] Gregory of Tours (x. c. 1) and Paul. Diacon. (*de Gest. Lang.*, iii. c. 24) speak of this *Litania Septiformis*; and Laderchius, *de Sacris Basil. SS. Mart. Marcell.*, iii. c. 10, treats of it in general. All seven ecclesiastical regions are here mentioned; III. and IV. correspond with the earliest designations; not so, however, the remainder. No church is mentioned in the Trastevere, the Litany not being arranged in strict accordance with the regional divisions.

tomb, the most wonderful of all earthly monuments.[1]

Other legends ascribe the cessation of the pestilence to a portrait of the Virgin borne by the Pope in the procession. Of the seven pictures of the Madonna, which we owe to no less an artist than the Apostle Luke, Rome possesses four, of which that of Ara Coeli is esteemed the earliest. The silver doors of the shrine, which formerly enclosed the sacred picture within the church, were likewise engraved with a representation of the legend. This work belongs to the fifteenth century, but a picture on slate representing a procession in the act of carrying a bier across a bridge, where the fortress towers in the background, is of a later date.[2]

[1] The present figure was placed on the fortress by Benedict XIV. The angel sheathing the sword would be the most beautiful symbol of the priesthood, whose mission it is to spread peace on earth. Unfortunately, however, it scarcely applies to the Popes, who usurped also the power of the sword. The legend is not mentioned by either of Gregory's biographers, Paul. or Joh. Diacon., nor yet by Bede or Gregory of Tours. It is first to be found, repeated from ancient traditions, in the *Legenda Aurea* (end of the thirteenth century) and in a German sermon belonging to the twelfth or thirteenth. Müllenhof in Haupt's *Zeitschr.*, vol. 12, p. 321. The legend, which is of earlier date than the tenth century, may possibly have owed its origin to some statue, perhaps of a winged genius, which had remained on the summit of the mausoleum.

[2] The inscription says: *Lucae et Lucis Opus. Virgo haec quam cernis in ara circumvecta nigram dispulit urbi luem.* Casimiro (*Gesch. von S. Maria in Ara Coeli*) gives the Byzantine portrait of the Madonna, and an arid dissertation on the subject. The custom of carrying images of the saints in Gregory's time is, however, not otherwise known to me. The memory of the legend has been celebrated down to our own days [until the prohibition of processions in 1870,—Translator], the great procession from S. Marco striking up the Antiphony *Regina Coeli* when it reached the Ponte S. Angelo.

## CHAPTER II.

1. Gregory consecrated Pope—His First Sermon—Rome harassed by the Lombards—Gregory pronounces her Funeral Oration—Purchases the Withdrawal of the Lombards.

The ratification of the election arrived from Constantinople, but Gregory shrank in dismay from the high mission which lay before him.[1] He himself admits that he sought to avoid it by flight, and in the ninth century legend related that he had caused himself to be conveyed secretly from Rome by some merchants, and hidden in a wooded ravine. The citizens who followed in search were guided to his retreat by a radiant dove, or a column of light, and the reluctant candidate was led back in triumph to S. Peter's, and there consecrated Pope

[1] S. Gregor., Ep. 4, lib. i. His first letters, especially those to Theoktista, sister of the Emperor, give vent to his lamentations over the lost happiness of the contemplative life: *Contemplativae vitae pulchritudinem velut Rachelem dilexi sterilem sed videntem et pulcram, quae etsi per quietem suam minus generat, lucem tamen subtilius videt. Lea mihi in nocte conjuncta est, activa videlicet vita, fecunda, sed lippa, minus videns, quamvis amplius parens.* The references to Rachel and Leah were afterwards made use of by Dante and Michael Angelo.

on Sept. 3, 590.[1] He found the Church, to use his own expression, an old wreck, swept by the waves on every side, and whose timbers, shaken by the storm, threatened immediate shipwreck.

Gregory's first sermon.

The terrible condition of Rome afforded him material for his first sermon. When at this time the Roman bishop (in the truest sense of the term the priest and father of his people) ascended the pulpit, the words to which he gave utterance were indeed historic actuality. Gregory summoned the remnant of the citizens to S. Peter's, and the wretched descendants of Cicero, crowded together in the gloomy basilica, listened in feverish suspense as their forefathers had listened to the orators in the Temple of Concord.

"Our Lord," so spoke the dejected bishop, "desires to find us ready, and shows us the misery of the worn-out world, in order to divert our love from it. You see how many storms have heralded its approaching overthrow. If we do not seek God in quiet, trials the most dreadful will teach us to fear His approaching judgment. In the extract of the Gospel we have just heard, the Lord forewarns us that nation shall prevail against nation and kingdom against kingdom, and that earthquakes, famine and pestilence, horrors and signs from heaven are in

[1] S. Greg., Ep. 4, lib. vi.: *secretiora loca petere aliquando decreveram;* and the *praef.* of the *liber Pastoralis: pastoralis curae me pondera fugere delitiscendo voluisse.* Gregory of Tours, x. c. 1, merely says: *cum latibula fugae praepararet, capitur.* Joh. Diacon., however, i. c. 49, gives the legend of the flight, and Paul. Diacon., *Vita*, c. 11, relates that he was carried away in a basket, and that a column of light revealed his hiding-place.

store for us.[1] We have already been visited by some of these disasters and of others remain in dread. For that nation rises against nation and subdues the land by fear, our own experience, more forcibly than even gospel history, might have taught us. We have heard from other quarters that countless cities are destroyed by earthquakes; while we ourselves suffer incessantly from pestilence. True, we do not yet perceive signs in the sun, moon or stars, but changes in the atmosphere lead us to suppose that such signs are near at hand. Fiery swords, reddened with the blood of mankind, which soon after flowed in streams, were seen in the heavens before Italy became a prey to the Lombards. Be alert and watchful! Those who love God should shout for joy at the end of the world. Those who mourn are they whose hearts are rooted in love for the world, and who neither long for the future life, nor have any foretaste of it within themselves. Every day the earth is visited by fresh calamities. You see how few remain of the innumerable population; each day sees us chastened by fresh afflictions, and unforeseen blows strike us to the ground. The world grows old and hoary, and through a sea of troubles hastens to approaching death."[2]

Gregory's first sermon reflects the temper of his time, when Rome fell to decay, and mankind, although bearing within itself so many germs of a new life, was yet unable to perceive anything beyond the accumulated ruin of the Empire. In the midst of that ruin,

[1] Evang. Lucae, xxi. 10, 11.

[2] Homily I. on the Gospels, edition of the Benedictines, i. 1436.

as if waiting for death, stood the effete and worn-out Romans, but the same bishop who enjoined his flock to familiarise themselves with the idea of destruction, provided at the same time for their escape. The welfare of the city was his first care, and the times were of such a nature that the bishop was obliged to regard himself as its true regent. In the universal distress there was but one asylum, the Church, and but one helper and saviour, the Pope. Famine ruled in the deserted city; Gregory wrote to Justin, the Praetor of Sicily, which still remained the granary of Rome, for an immediate supply of grain.[1] A small portion of this supply may have been furnished by the Emperor, but the greater part was provided by the Church from the resources of her own wealthy patrimony. Famine, however, was more easily averted than the pressure of the enemy; the sword of King Autharis or that of Ariulf, Duke of Spoleto, the successor of Faroald, being now directed against Rome, round which the Lombards hovered as vultures round a corpse. The garrison was insignificant and mutinous from want of pay. "If the Chartularius Maurentius comes," wrote Gregory to the Scholasticus Paulus, "I pray you help him to relieve the general distress, since, while the sword of the enemy threatens us incessantly from without, we are menaced by still greater dangers from the rebellious soldiers within."[2]

Gregory the father of his people.

The invitations of the Emperor Maurice had once more induced Childebert of France to take the field

[1] S. Gregor., Ep. 2, lib. i. The expression *Sitonicum* is frequently used in the letters instead of *annona*.

[2] Ep. 3, lib. i.

against Autharis in 590; but hunger and pestilence having mown down the ranks of the Frankish army in Lombardy, the scheme undertaken in conjunction with the Exarch proved unsuccessful. However, keeping, as it did, the enemy at a distance, it stood Rome in good stead. Autharis himself died in 590, and his widow, the Bavarian princess Theodolinda, bestowed her hand and the crown of the Lombards on the heroic Agilulf, Duke of Turin. The new ruler, fortunately for the Church, was accessible to the influence of his Catholic wife, and Rome, which sighed for a lasting peace, might have enjoyed at least temporary tranquillity, could the wishes of the Pope have been brought into harmony with the policy or energy of the Exarch. Ariulf of Spoleto and King Agilulf themselves reduced the city to the direst extremities in 593. Gregory, in a letter to the Archbishop of Ravenna, bitterly laments the intrigues of the Exarch Romanus, who prevented the conclusion of peace, the Pope at the same time expressing the proud consciousness that in rank and dignity he far surpassed the Imperial official. Urging the archbishop to prevail on the Exarch to make terms with Ariulf, Gregory laments that the Imperial troops had been withdrawn, and that the Theodosian, the sole regiment that was left, would scarcely exert itself to guard the walls, because the men had not received their proper pay.[1]

The Lombards harass Rome.

[1] Ep. 32, lib. ii. Ind. x. *Theodosiani vero, qui hic remanserunt, rogam non accipientes, vix ad murorum quidem custodiam se accomodant.* ῥόγα is *donativum* or *stipendium*, *Erogator* the paymaster. Ep. 129, lib. vii. Ind. ii. to the Erogator Donellus.

Arrival of the Exarch Romanus in Rome.

Romanus had previously come to Rome; the first Exarch who, so far as we are aware, ever entered the city. People and clergy, ranged in companies and bearing their banners, came to meet him, and conducted him from the Lateran, where he was received by the Pope, to his dwelling in the ancient Palace of the Caesars,[1] the Greek patrician being accorded the honours due to the Emperor he represented. He came, however, with empty hands; gave the people no festivals; and, after having doubtlessly extorted gold from the treasury of the Church, departed, taking the Greek mercenaries, even to the Theodosian regiment, with him, in order to transfer them to other threatened towns, such as Narni and Perugia. The main cause, however, which had driven Agilulf to arms had been the violation of treaty by the Exarch in the occupation of the now Lombard cities of Tuscany, Horta, Polimartium and Bleda; further, the treason of Perugia, recently conquered by the Lombards—treason to which their own Duke Mauritius had allowed himself to become a party. Seeing Perugia attacked, the fears of adjacent Rome must have been roused to the uttermost; and scarcely had the Umbrian city fallen into the power of the King in 593, when he appeared in all his strength before the capital.

The approach of the Lombards interrupted Gregory in his public explanation of Ezekiel. He himself informs us that the sight of men who had suffered mutilation, and the news of the imprisonment and death of others, had caused him to forsake

[1] Hieron., *Rubeus Hist. Ravenn.*, iv. p. 187.

his studies.[1] These sermons, preached under the influence of contemporary events, although tinged with the colouring of rhetoric, faithfully depict the historic condition of Rome, and in the eighteenth Homily we possess a picture of the period of inestimable value.

Gregory delivers the funeral oration on Rome.

"What is there in the world," exclaims Gregory, "to gladden us? All around is mourning; all around is sighing. Cities are destroyed; fortresses levelled to the ground; farms laid waste; the earth reduced to a desert. No husbandman is left in the fields, scarcely a dweller remains in the towns and still the small remnant of mankind is daily stricken. The chastisement of divine justice knows no end, because the debt of sin, even under such punishments, is not wiped away. We see some led into captivity, some maimed, others put to death. We are forced to recognise the position to which Rome, once the mistress of the world, is reduced. She is bowed down by pain unfathomable, by depopulation, by the assaults of the enemy and the weight of her own ruins, so that in her seems to be fulfilled the fate which the prophet Ezekiel predicted for Samaria: 'Set on the pot, set it on, I say, and also pour water into it: gather the pieces thereof into it'; and further, 'it seethed and boiled, and its bones were cooked.' And again, 'Heap up the bones together that I may kindle them with fire; the meat shall be consumed, and the whole mass shall be cooked, and the bones shall dissolve. Set the empty pot also over the fagots,

[1] Paul. Diacon., *de Gest. Lang.*, iv. c. 8; S. Gregor., *Praefat. in lib. ii. super Esechiel.*, and Homily VI.

that it may become hot and that its brass may be molten. Yes, the pot was set up for us when Rome was founded, and when people collected in the city from every quarter of the earth, and their actions seethed within her, even as hot water within the pot. Therefore it is excellently said: 'It seethed and bubbled, and the bones were cooked in the midst thereof.' The desire for earthly glory first seethed strongly within her; although the glory itself disappeared with those who sought after it. The bones signify the powerful ones of the earth; the flesh, the nations; since as the meat is borne by the bones, so will the weakness of nations be governed by the mighty ones of the earth. But see! how all the mighty men of the world are taken from her; the bones thereof have been dissolved. The nations have revolted; the flesh also is consumed. Therefore may it be said: 'Heap the bones together that I may kindle them with fire; the flesh shall be consumed, and the whole mass shall be cooked, and the bones shall dissolve.' Where is the Senate? Where is the people? The bones are dissolved, the flesh consumed. All the glory of earthly dignity has expired within the city. All her greatness has vanished, and yet the few of us that remain are daily oppressed by the sword and afflictions innumerable. Therefore it may be said: 'Set up the empty pot upon the coals thereof.' For because there is no Senate the people perished, and since the trouble and sighing of those that remain wax daily, so does the empty city already burn. But why do we speak thus of men when we see the very buildings themselves fall to pieces?

Therefore of the already deserted city it is seasonably added: 'Let her become hot and her brass shall dissolve.' Already the pot in which flesh as well as bones have previously been consumed, is itself in process of dissolution, for after the inhabitants have perished, the walls themselves fall in. Where are those who once delighted in the glory of Rome? Where is their pomp? Where their pride? Where their frequent and unmeasured delight? In them is fulfilled the saying of the prophet against Nineveh that was destroyed: 'Where is the dwelling of the lion and the feeding-place of the lion's whelps?' Were not her generals and princes the lions, who, bloodthirsty and greedy of gain, overran the whole earth in search of plunder? The young lions found their food when boys and youths, children of the worldly-minded, gathered from all sides eager to secure their temporal fortune. Behold, therefore! now is the city deserted; now is she destroyed and weighed down with groaning. None any longer hasten to her to seek their fortune in this world. No mighty men: no oppressor is left. Of such as acquired booty by violence, not one remains behind. Wherefore we ask, 'Where is the dwelling of the lion and the food of the young lion?' It has befallen Rome even as the prophet said of Judaea: 'Her baldness spreads like that of the eagle.' The baldness of man is confined to the head, but that of the eagle extends over the whole body, since when the eagle grows old his plumes and feathers fall from him. And like the eagle bereft of its plumage, is the baldness of the city deprived of her inhabitants. The pinions on which she was wont to

fly in search of prey have fallen, now that all the heroes, by whose means the city despoiled her enemies, have passed away."[1]

The Romans, amongst whom aged men, born in the greater days of Theodoric, still lingered, must have felt their hearts fail them in despair as they listened to these utterances of pain, amid the solemn silence of the basilica, and in presence of the saints, whose stern likenesses looked down upon them from the walls. The desperate fate of the city stood like a fulfilled prophecy before their eyes. We have no more terrible picture of the condition to which Rome was reduced at the end of the sixth century than this assemblage of her citizens and the sermon of the Pope, the magnificent imagery of which, allying, as it does, the history of the capital of the Roman Empire to the prophecies of the Jews, arouses a feeling of sadness utterly tragic. It was the funeral oration pronounced by the bishop beside the grave of Rome. This bishop was her noblest patriot, the last scion of an ancient and illustrious house, and his words were instinct with the very breath of Roman patriotism.

Agilulf lays siege to Rome.

Agilulf besieged Rome, but without energy; otherwise how could the city have resisted the attack, when, according to Gregory's assertion, "being thinly populated and devoid of military aid," it was thrown on the protection of S. Peter or of

[1] *Ubi enim senatus? ubi jam populus? Contabuerunt ossa; consumptae sunt carnes: omnis in ea secularium dignitatum fastus extinctus est. Quia enim senatus deest, populus interiit—jam vacua ardet Roma.*

God.[1] As the Pope mounted to the battlements of the now tottering walls of Aurelian and Belisarius he beheld with his own eyes Roman citizens, coupled together like dogs, led captive by the Lombards, to be sold as slaves in Gaul, and while the Prefect Gregory and the Magister Militum Castorius, the only Imperial officials of rank in the city, conducted the doubtful defence, the repeated assaults against the gates may well have struck him with dismay. Neither to the vigilance of the defenders, nor to the endurance of the citizens, but to the coffers of the Church was due the withdrawal of the enemy, and Gregory, writing later to the Empress Constantia, terms himself, with an ironical sigh, "the paymaster of the Lombards, under whose swords the Roman people only preserved its life thanks to the daily ransom paid by the Church."[2]

The Pope purchases his withdrawal.

The deliverance of the city brought the Pope no thanks from the Emperor; on the contrary, the Exarch strove to awake suspicion in Byzantium regarding the Bishop, who was dangerous to his own importance. He was apparently indignant that the latter had negotiated with the enemy on his own authority. Maurice wrote a violent letter to Gregory, reproaching him that during the siege Rome had not been sufficiently provided with corn. He upbraids him, in a word, as a simpleton, because he had allowed himself to be deluded by Ariulf's promise of coming to Rome to arrange the terms of peace. To the Imperial letter

[1] *In qua (urbe) sine magnitudine populi, et sine adjutoriis militum tot annis inter gladios illaesi, deo auctore, servamur.* Ep. 23, lib. vii. Ind. i.

[2] Ep. 43, lib. iv. Ind. xiii.

Gregory answered with the humility due from a subject to his Emperor, but also with conscious dignity and diplomatic address. After enumerating the dangers to which the attitude of the Exarch had exposed him, and the sufferings which followed, and assuring the Emperor that he would accept, as a title of honour, the affront experienced at his hands, he seeks to protect the Imperial officials from disgrace by extolling their active vigilance in the defence of the city.[1]

### 2. Condition of the Temporal Government in Rome—The Imperial Officials—Silence regarding the Senate.

Administration of Rome.

The mention of the Prefect and the Magister Militum invites us to devote a passing glance to the secular government of the city, and to touch, in consequence, on one of the darkest spots of her history. We have seen that at this time no "Dux" is mentioned in Rome, and that a Roman "Ducatus" is nowhere spoken of.[2] On the other hand, we find in some towns "comites" and "tribuni," and in Rome and the territory belonging to it "Magistri Militum," who were regarded as general commandants, and were evidently invested with the full powers of a "Dux." The latter official, however, only occasionally appears in Rome,

[1] Ep. 40, lib. v. Ind. xiii. The words: *si terrae meae captivitas per quotidiana momenta non excresceret*, deserve attention. Gregory felt himself the head of the Roman State.

[2] The *Dux Sardiniae* is mentioned (Ep. 46, 47, lib. i.); *Dux Arimini*, 56, i.; *Dux Campaniae*, 12, viii.; *Dux Neapolis*, 5, xii.

as, for instance, when Castorius conducted the defence against Agilulf.[1] To the Dux, however, all military affairs and the jurisdiction accompanying them were entrusted, although the pay of the troops, under the name of *roga*, *precarium*, or *donativum*, sent from Ravenna or Constantinople to Rome, passed through the hands of the erogator on its arrival.[2]

Prefects.

The Prefect is more frequently mentioned in Gregory's letters, but only in one instance with the significant title Urbis.[3] The Pope often speaks of prefects without any further distinction, and we must not therefore assume that the City Prefect is always present to his mind. There was a Prefect of Italy as well as of Africa and Illyricum; prefects also of the three dioceses, which had formerly been placed under the Praefectus Praetorio of Italy. Gregory names these officials in his letters,[4] and the position of the prefect, which clearly differs from that of the Exarch, is more intelligible to us than that of the Proconsul of Italy.[5] The prefect directly conducted all civil

[1] In the neighbourhood of the city, and probably also commissioned to act for Rome itself, were the *Magistri Militum* Velox and Mauricius, Ep. 21, xii. Ind. 7. *Mag. Milit.* are also frequently mentioned in Sicily and Naples: 25, xii. 13, 71, 75, vii.

[2] Ep. 129, vii. Ind. 2; Ep. 2, viii. Ind. 3.

[3] *Praefectus Urbis Johannes:* Ep. 7, viii., and so too Gregory, who has been already mentioned, was City Prefect (Ep. 40, v.).

[4] Georgius, Praef. Italiae. In Ep. 22, 23, 37, 38, i. 24, xii. and 1 v. are distinguished: *excell. Romanum Patricium* (Exarch) *et per emin. Praefectum, atque per alios Civitatis suae nob. viros. Praef. Africae*, 37, viii.; *Illyrici*, 21, ii.; *Siciliae*, 38, iii. (here other MSS. give *Praetor*). Panciroli, *Notitia Imp. occid.*, p. 115, says without ground: *Italiae serius recuperatae suus Praefectus redditus non invenitur.*

[5] *Proconsul Italiae* (Ep. 20, viii.). Gregory complains to the Pro-

affairs, financial as well as those dealing with the jurisdiction and administration of the city. The recommendation of the Pope generally influenced the appointment, not only to the Prefecture of Italy, but also to that of the city. In 602 the ex-Prefect Quertinus besought Gregory to intercede with the Emperor in favour of Bonitus, a candidate for the prefecture, evidently that of Italy. The Pope replied that it was a painful office, and, moreover, that it was highly unsuitable that a man devoted to learning should occupy himself with accounts; but that, although regretting the future annoyance of the man, he would not oppose the appointment, because the candidate, by the example of his predecessors, had been made aware of the troubles that awaited him.[1] In truth the letters of the ex-prefect reveal striking proofs of his experience.

The prefects on retiring from their posts were obliged to render an account to their successors in office or to deputies; and their high rank (Gregory bestows on them the titles of *Magnificus*, *Gloriosus*, and *Illustrissimus*) did not in many cases avail to protect them from a truly barbarous punishment. The ex-Prefect Libertinus, summoned before the extraordinary tribunal of the ex-Consul Leontius in Sicily, was ignominiously beaten with rods. In consequence of this atrocity, Gregory, filled with a noble

consul, that the Diaconate of Naples had been deprived of the annona, and refers to the action of John, his predecessor in office. A Proconsul Dalmatiae, Ep. 3, vii. The Proconsuls had not yet ceased to exist, as Blondus and Giannone falsely assume.

[1] Ep. 30, x.: *quia quid passurus sit, exemplo praecedentium non nescimus.*

indignation, wrote to Leontius, the finest in the whole collection of his letters, a letter which reflects the greatest honour on the character of the writer. He herein speaks as a Roman, justly indignant at the thought that a free man should be scourged. "This," he says, recollecting former times, "is the difference between barbarian Kings and Roman Emperors; the former are the lords of slaves, the latter of free men. In all your dealings you ought to keep first, justice, and secondly freedom, before your eyes." He threatens Leontius with the power conferred on him by his position as Roman bishop: "had I," said he, "found the accused in the right, it would have behoved me to warn you before by letter, and had I failed to obtain your attention I should then have turned to the Emperor."[1] This letter clearly shows us the authority which Gregory assumed over public officials, even those of high rank, the actions of these men being subject to his supervision.

Threatened officials sought his protection. It was the custom for government functionaries, when retiring from office, to fly for refuge to the asylums offered by the Church, and there to remain until assured of their safety by an Imperial notary. The ex-Prefect Gregory adopted this course, and we find a series of letters from the Pope to various influential persons, in which he earnestly recommends the fugitive for protection against the despotism of the judges.[2]

[1] Ep. 51, x. Ind. 3. Gregory addresses a beautiful letter of consolation to the criminal punished for embezzlement: Ep. 31, viii. Baronius fitly compares his relations to Leontius with those of Cicero to Verres.

[2] Ep. 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, viii.

From this revelation of dishonourable practices, it is evident how even the higher ranks of officialism had been corrupted by the influence of Byzantine despotism.

The City Prefect.

In the time of Gratian and Valentinian the Prefect of the city was an exalted official, Princeps of the Senate, taking precedence of all patricians and consuls. His jurisdiction, from the time of Augustus onwards, extended as far as the hundredth milestone; and to him appeal was made from the suburban provinces. All public affairs in the city were under his control; the annona and the markets, the census, river, harbours, walls, aqueducts, the public spectacles and the monuments of the city. The decline of Rome brought with it the decline of the office; nevertheless, in the sixth century it remained so important that although the political and military government belonged to the Magister Militum, the entire civil administration devolved on the City Prefect. Thus alone can be explained the fact that, next to the military commander, the Prefect Gregory was the foremost person in the defence and custody of the city. In the seventh century, however, these comprehensive powers disappeared before the influence of the military official, who now gained complete supremacy; and, while the City Prefect found his office restricted to jurisdiction, his importance sank under that of the Dux of Rome—the Governor General. After the year 600, at which date the Prefecture was filled by John, we cease to hear of the office altogether, until it reappears in 774. This celebrated municipal institution, which in

the later Middle Ages acquired a by no means insignificant degree of power, endured, although in altered form, as the sole surviving office of antiquity.[1]

Besides the City Prefect and the Magister Militum or Dux there were in Rome other Imperial officials, the nature of whose duties is however unknown; and occasionally an Imperial messenger appeared, whose despotism occasioned no slight dismay.[2] How it fared with regard to the Senate we do not know. Such authors as assert the continuance of the Curia have no other reason to assign for their opinion than the passage already referred to in the Pragmatic Sanction of Justinian, the account of Menander of the mission of some senators to Constantinople in 579, or the existence of the Prefect, whom they explain to have been head of the Senate, according to ancient custom. All such arguments, however, are untenable, and fall before the silence of the historian. It is utterly incredible that, had the Curia

Extinction of the Senate in its older form.

[1] Felix Contelorius, *de Praefecto Urbis* (Roma, 1631), is only important for the later Middle Ages. He was followed, though only down to the year 600, by Corsini (*de Praefectis Urbis*, Pisa, 1766). I find that the Prefect John bore the titles *Palatinus* and *Patricius* (51, 52, viii.), and observe that the title *Patricius*, later borne exclusively by the Exarchs, was still common in his time. *Opilio Patricius*, Ep. 27, xii. *Venantius Patricius*, 33, i. 42, 43, v., &c. His wife even was called *Patricia*, 128, vii.; also the Roman lady Rusticiana. I do not, however, speak of the *Patricius Galliarum*, a title bestowed by the Frankish Kings: 33, ii. 17, xii.

[2] Thus a *Comes privatorum Beator: hic qui quasi comes privatorum dici vult, venisse et multa contra omnes agere.* Ep. 26, xi. Ind. 6. In Ep. 29, xii., Gregory speaks of *diversa officia palatii urbis Romae*, for whom he begs the *annona*.

still survived as the Council of Magistrates or the representative of the political rights of the *Respublica Romana* in the time of Gregory, the Pope could have ignored its existence when dealing with the weightiest affairs of state. We shall see that, in his negotiations for peace with Agilulf in 599, Gregory makes use of the Abbot Probus as his agent, and neither of senators, nor of any share taken by the Senate in political matters, is there the slightest mention. Further, when Agilulf sent his messengers to Rome, the signature of the Pope was alone required to the treaty of peace; not a single word reveals the existence of the Senate. We can, therefore, at most suppose that the Senate subsisted as a corporation of "decuriones," according to the highly doubtful analogy of the cities of Italy, which, as yet unconquered by the Lombards, still preserved some remains of the Roman Curial constitution.[1] There is, however, no mention of a Curia in this sense, and we therefore revert to the celebrated utterances of Gregory's eighteenth Homily, which speaks of the non-existence

[1] Troya, *Osserv. sul. Gov. di Roma nel* 595 (*Cod. Dip. Long.*, i. 131), is at pains to prove the continued existence of the Senate, and when (n. 401) a *Senator filius Albini* appears at the court of Luitprand in 717, recognises in him a *Senator Romanus*. But as late as the year 874 a Bishop of Torcelli was called by the name of senator, a name which had also been borne by Cassiodorus. Troya, nevertheless, rejects Savigny's view, that the decurionate, in spite of the Lombard conquest, still survived in Italian cities; an error later refuted by Carl Hegel. The latter author thinks that the term *Ordo* (*Clero, Ordini et Plebi*), customary in Gregory's time, was a form in use at the Chancellor's court, and explains it as signifying the position of *Honorati et Possessores*, holding that the Curia had already become extinct (*Gesch. der Städteverfassung*, i. c. 2).

of the Senate, as actual proof of our view.[1] Nevertheless, we can scarcely believe in the entire absence of a civic corporation; such a body, in fact, reappears under the name of *Ordo*, and a part of this *Ordo* must have been that corporation, afterwards called the *Concilium*, a council of administrative officials, which possessed restricted civic jurisdiction under the City Prefect.

Although the records of the government of the city at this time are very scanty, so much at least is certain, that the military, civil and political power in the city was in the hands of the Emperor's officials, while a certain supervision belonged to the Pope, to whom recourse was made in case of appeal. Generally speaking, we find the Pope restricted to the Church and its jurisdiction; nevertheless, Gregory, as possessing the faculties suited to the circumstances of the time, was brought into a position which made him the tacitly recognised head of Rome, and with perfect right he is looked upon as the founder of the temporal dominion of the Papacy.

[1] Vendettini (*del Senato Rom.*, i. c. 2) seeks to uphold the existence of the Senate in spite of this Homily, and Troya considers that Gregory's utterances are exaggerated. Savigny, i. 367, maintains that Gregory's letters give evidence of the Senate. I, however, am not acquainted with any passage which supports Savigny's view, beyond that in the letter which speaks of the reception of the portrait of Phocas by clerus and Senate, a passage which I believe to be a later addition, due to the editor of the letters. *Senatus deest, populus interiit*, says Gregory. Supposing that, like *interiit*, *deest* is merely rhetorical, and that the embassy of senators in 579 proves the survival of the Senate, it is, nevertheless, the survival of a name merely, and not the reality.

### 3. Gregory's Attitude with regard to the City—His Care for the People—Administration of the Ecclesiastical Property.

Growing power of the bishop.

Gregory's influence far outweighed the power of the Imperial officials, the Romans reverencing their master and preserver in a Pope who united in his person the episcopal dignity and the renown of illustrious descent. Since the fall of the Gothic kingdom had extinguished the last remains of public life in the city, Rome had suffered a complete transformation. Neither consuls, senate, nor games recalled the temporal dominion; the patrician families had almost entirely disappeared. Gregory's letters do not speak of any of the wealthy houses of ancient descent, except of such as had removed to Constantinople,[1] while time-honoured names are discovered connected with estates which already belonged to the Church.[2] Religious interests had completely thrust civic affairs into the background, and, as we have already seen, the Roman people had adopted an entirely spiritual garb. There were no longer any public festivals but those of the Church.

[1] The wealthy Patricia Rusticiana had withdrawn to Byzantium, and Gregory seems in vain to have invited her to return. She consoled herself with pilgrimages to Sinai, and the Pope with gifts; sending him, for instance, ten pounds in gold to purchase the freedom of slaves, and silken hangings for S. Peter's; demanding, however, that the draperies should be borne in solemn procession to the basilica. Gregory wrote her five letters.

[2] Thus in the deed of gift of property to S. Paul we find the estates: *Antonianus*, *Cassianus*, *Cornelius*, *Primianus*. Ep. 9, xii. Ind. 7.

The only events which occupied the minds of the indolent people were of a spiritual nature. The Church had already become a great asylum for Society. Under the influence of natural disasters, hitherto unparalleled, and of the horrors of war, the belief in the approaching end of the world had gained universal acceptance, and the crowd of men anxious to enter convents and the ranks of the priesthood assumed overwhelming proportions. The needy there found food and shelter; the ambitious, dignity and rank, in an age when the titles of deacon presbyter and bishop had become for the Romans what those of praetor, tribune and consul had formerly been esteemed. Even soldiers deserted their colours for the tonsure, and the candidates for ecclesiastical offices were in all classes so numerous, that Gregory strove to enforce some restraint, while the Emperor Maurice, by an edict of 592, forbade soldiers from entering the cloister and civil officials from being nominated to ecclesiastical offices.[1] Roman poverty did not stretch out its hands in vain for the treasures of the Church. The times when the consul scattered gold among the people, when the prefect provided for the public distributions of

[1] Joh. Diacon., *Vita*, ii. c. 16. Hence a misunderstanding arose between Gregory and the Emperor. Ep. 62, 65, ii. We have, on the other hand, the case of a man forsaking the cloister to assume secular office. The Patricius Venantius became *ex monacho Cancellarius* of Italy, and drew upon himself the censures of Gregory. Ep. 33, i. Constantine, in 320, had forbidden the decuriones, the unfortunate slaves of the financial burdens of the State, from taking refuge in the priesthood. *Cod. Theodos.*, xvi. 2, 3. The Emperors continually strove to prevent the competition of secular officials for ecclesiastical dignities.

corn, meat, oil and lard from the coffers of the State, no longer existed, and the cry of the people for "*Panem et Circenses*" made itself but half-heard. They desired bread, and the Pope gave it abundantly. Even as a monk in his cell on the Clivus Scauri Gregory had daily fed the poor; as Pope he still ministered to their necessities. At the beginning of every month he distributed corn, clothes and money to the needy, and at each of the great festivals bestowed gifts on the Church and on chantable institutions. Like Titus, he held the day lost on which he had not satisfied hunger and clothed nakedness, and once, hearing that a beggar had died in the streets, filled with remorse, he shut himself up, and did not venture to approach the altar, as priest, for several days.

The public distribution of corn had in ancient times been made from porticoes, theatres and granaries of the State. The Romans now thronged to the porches of convents and basilicas to receive food and clothing from spiritual officials. The crowds of pilgrims from beyond the seas found the ancient house in Portus, erected for their use by the Senator Pammachius, the friend of S. Jerome, ready for their reception, and on reaching Rome, whether as pilgrims or as fugitives seeking protection from the Lombards, received food and lodging in the hospitals, or in quarters provided for the purpose. Christian benevolence exercised true charity in the relief of genuine distress.[1]

[1] The public washing of the feet and banquets to the pilgrims at Easter, now degraded into theatrical representations, in which

Ecclesiastical property.

The property which gradually accrued to the Church in gifts and legacies from private individuals was conscientiously devoted by Gregory to charitable objects. And the ecclesiastical possessions were already so vast and numerous that the Pope, if not as yet wielding authority over dukedoms, had at least become the richest landowner in Italy. He found himself in the capacity of owner of the hereditary estates of the church, and exercising over them a definite though limited jurisdiction, he appeared in the light of a great temporal prince.[1] The property of the Roman Church, assigned to the Apostle Peter, was scattered over various countries. It consisted of vast patrimonies or domains in Sicily and Campania, over the whole of Southern Italy, in Dalmatia, Illyria, Gaul, Sardinia, Corsica, Liguria and the Cottian Alps. And, as a king sends ministers into his provinces, the Pope sent deacons and sub-deacons (*rectores patrimonii*), officials who united the attributes of spiritual with those of temporal overseers, or government councillors.[2] The accounts of these officials were severely scrutinised, for the honourable man determined that "the treasury of the Church should not be defiled by questionable gains."

poverty and Christian humility are simply masks, date apparently from Gregory's days.

[1] Brunengo, *Le origini della sovranità temporale dei Papi*, Rome, 1862, p. 25, f., has well described the influence which these vast possessions had in forming the character of the temporal power of the Papacy.

[2] Joh. Diacon., *Vita*, ii. c. 53, and the numerous letters addressed by Gregory to these sub-deacons.

The many letters which he addressed to these rectors of patrimonies give an insight into the condition of the Roman peasant, such as it remained for several centuries. The property of the Church was cultivated by *coloni*, men bound to the soil, who paid a tax in money or in kind. It was usually named *pensio*, and collected by *conductores* or farmers of revenue. These officials frequently extorted half the gains of the coloni, and while they arbitrarily raised the measure of corn, at times compelled the peasants to increase the "modius" from the legitimate 16 sextarii, or 24 Roman pounds, to 25 sextarii, and out of 20 bushels of grain to surrender one. Gregory taxed these oppressions, fixing the modius decisively at 18 sextarii, and decreeing that out of 35 bushels one only was to be given up. These regulations affected Sicily, still the granary of Rome, from which regularly twice in the year, in spring and autumn, a fleet of corn sailed to Portus to supply the storehouses of the city.[1] Were supplies lost at sea, the loss fell upon the poor coloni, amongst whom the compensation was divided; and Gregory warned the rectors not to delay the voyage beyond the favourable season, otherwise the loss would be ascribed to them. The economical regulations were exemplary. A register was kept for each colonus, called *Libellus securitatis*. This register stated the price paid, and to it the colonus could appeal. Had a failure of harvest or other misfortune befallen him, he might reckon on the equity of the Pope to accord him a new inventory of cows, sheep and swine. S. Peter's estates in Sicily

[1] Ep. 70, lib. i.

prospered, and many salutary improvements were instituted. The great Pope proved himself an excellent landlord, and, when sitting his horse in a procession, might have boasted that his palfrey was provided by the same ancient Trinacria, the renowned horses of which had once been the theme of Pindar's song. We cherish some doubts, however, as to whether Pindar would have considered the descendant race of apostolic steeds worthy of an ode. "Thou hast sent me," Gregory once wrote to the sub-deacon, Peter, "a miserable horse and five good asses. The horse I cannot ride, because he is wretched, nor mount the asses, because they are asses."[1]

Patrimonies within Roman territory.

S. Peter's property within Roman territory consisted of four separate groups on both sides the Tiber. The Patrimonium Appiae, which comprised the entire district between the Via Appia and the sea, as far as the Via Latina; the Labicanense between the Via Labicana and the Anio; the Tiburtinum between the Via Tiburtina and the Tiber; lastly, the Patrimonium

[1] Ep. 30, lib. xii. Ind. 7. After the loss of the Sicilian estates, the Popes obtained horses from France. Adrian entreats Charles: *tales nobis famosissimos mittite equos, qui ad nostram sessionem facere debeant.* Cod. Carol., Ep. lxvii. (in Cenni, lxxxi. p. 440). With regard to the coloni, see Ep. 44, i. Ind. 9, *ad Petrum Subd. Sicil.*, and others: iv. 21, Ind. 12; ix. 18, 19, Ind. 2; xiii. 34, Ind. 6. The canon concerning grain is thus expressed: *pensionem integram et pensantem ad septuaginta bina persolvant.* The payment was called *pensio* (from *pensum*), also *burda* or *burdatio* (burthen?), *illatio burdationis.* A certain duty was called *siliquaticum.* Cassiodorus, *Var.*, lib. ii. ep. 30, iii. 25. When a colonus married, he paid a solidus, the *nuptiale commodum* to the *conductor.* Gregory expresses his principles in Ep. 44, i.: *quia nos saeculum ecclesiae ex lucris turpibus non volumus inquinari.* A golden maxim, which deserves to rescue from oblivion the letter which contains it.

Tusciae, the most extensive of the four, which comprised the tract on the right bank of the Tiber.[1] Besides these, the Church had acquired houses, gardens, and vineyards in the city itself, which together formed a *Patrimonium urbanum*.[2] Each division of the great patrimonial district was divided into tracts for husbandry, called *Fundus*, or *Massa*. With the title *Fundus* was designated a small piece of ground, to which *Casae* or *Casales* for the coloni belonged. Several *Fundi* together constituted a *Massa*, or, according to the current expression of present times, a "Tenuta," and several *Massae*, again, formed a Patrimony.

The Ager Romanus.

The Church had become the possessor of a great part of the Ager Romanus. Goths, Greeks and Lombards had, for two hundred years, trodden down the fields belonging to the city, and the traces of the enemy extended in ruins around the walls. The ground, on which some olive plantations alone remained, was cultivated but sparingly by basilicas, abbeys and noble landed proprietors. On the Campagna deserted hamlets, such as the Vicus Alexandri

[1] Zaccaria *de patrimonis S. R. E.*, in vol. ii., *de rebus ad hist. atque antiq. Eccl. pertinentibus*, Fulginii, 1781. Cenni, *Storici sull' agro Romano dal saec.* viii. *sino ai giorni nostri*, Roma, 1855, a useful little work, containing a plan of the Ager Romanus by Emidio Pitorri.

[2] The existence of a *Patrimonium urbanum* has been established by De Rossi, from a deed of gift of Pope Sergius I. to the church of S. Susanna on the Quirinal (*Bull. d. Arch. crist.*, 1870, p. 93), where the phrase occurs: *ex patrimonio urbano intra hanc urbem Romam.* . . See also G. Tomasetti, "Della Campagna Romana," *Arch. d. Società Rom.*, ii. (1879) p. 11. In this excellent work the circumstances of the Patrimonia are thoroughly treated.

and Subaugusta, crumbled to ruins. Convents owning a little cultivated land, and a great many catacomb churches, which have now disappeared, stood here and there amid the ruined villas of Roman nobles. The columns and blocks of marble belonging to the country houses of former days were carried off to adorn the neighbouring churches, as the monuments of the capital were despoiled for the construction of the city churches. The whole of the Roman Campagna, the most solemn and impressive plain in the world, was reduced, even in the sixth century, to an uncultivated waste.[1]

The Roman Church thus ruled over wide-spread districts in Latium, the Sabina and Tuscany, as also in the most distant provinces of Italy, and had therefore become a temporal power before the rise of the political ecclesiastical State, of which these patrimonies formed the actual foundations. While private property gradually disappeared, the wealth of her treasury remained unexhausted. Out of these resources the Pope was able to defray the expense of apparently incredible undertakings: the maintenance

[1] Gregory set apart the revenues of certain estates for the maintenance of the lamps in S. Paul's: *Massam quae aquas Salvias nuncupatur, cum omnib. fundis suis;* i.e., *Cella vinaria, Antoniano, villa Pertusa in foro Primiano, Cassiano Silonis, Cornelii, Thessalata atque Corneliano.* Ep. 14, xiv. Ind. 7. Thus the names of ancient families reappear. Even now the *Massa delle acque Salvie,* after the Victoriola and the Cesariana, is the largest in the Appian patrimony. That the name of the stream Almo still survived, is evident from the same Bull, which throws light on the neighbourhood of S. Paul's. On the right outside the gate stood the convent (for women) of S. Stephen, the Pissinian estate, and the *fossa latronis*; on the left, the possessions of the monastery of S. Edistius.

of the churches and of the city, the ransom of captives of war; further, the indemnity demanded for peace by the Lombards. To the treasury of her bishop Rome owed not only her release from these enemies, but occasionally also her almost independent position towards Ravenna, while the Church adopted the attitude of poverty towards the Emperor, and received with submissive gratitude the gift of a few pounds which he now and then let fall like golden drops of pity on the rubbish heap of Rome.[1]

Reduced by war, famine, and pestilence, united with Constantinople only through a few officials, and cut off from Ravenna by the Lombards, scarcely controlled by the Exarchs, and almost entirely devoid of military protection, Rome found in Pope Gregory a national and self-elected head.

### 4. Gregory makes Peace with Agilulf — Phocas Ascends the Throne of Byzantium and Receives Gregory's Congratulations — His Column in the Roman Forum.

Gregory's political influence.

Gregory in point of fact exercised almost the power of a sovereign, the reins of temporal government passing of themselves into his hands. That this was the case not alone with regard to the city, but also with respect to other places, is seen by the

[1] About 569 Maurice sent thirty pounds of gold to be divided among the clergy and the poor, a gift which was acknowledged by Gregory with thanks (Ep. 2, viii. Ind. 3). The Exarch, however, borrowed money from the Church (Ep. 129, vii. Ind. 2).

fact that he sent a certain Duke Leontius to the Tuscan fortress of Nepi, and admonished the clergy, ordo, and people to yield obedience to the orders of his nominee; further, that he even sent a tribune to Naples to protect the city already harassed by the Lombards, and that he commanded the troops therein stationed to obey his behests. He had previously commissioned Bishop Januarius of Cagliari, in Sardinia, to see that guards were everywhere on the alert,[1] and since Rome demanded his more immediate care, we can scarcely be surprised that, like a temporal overseer, he occupied himself with military measures, writing to the leaders of the troops that he did not esteem it right that the soldiers should be withdrawn from the city, and also that he communicated with the military commanders in regard to undertakings against the enemy.[2]

The disastrous condition into which Italy was sunk, and the urgent distress of Rome, made Gregory the mediator of peace, and it was owing to his energies that peace was at length restored. So conscious was he of the greatness of his power, that he informed the Emperor, through his Nuncio, that had he, the servant of the Emperor, desired the overthrow of the Lombards, they would no longer have had a king, or even a duke or count. Foreseeing their conversion, or dreading their revenge on

[1] Nepi, Ep. 2, xi. Ind. 10. Naples, Ep. 24, xii. Ind. 7: *Universis militibus Neapolitanis—magnif. virum Constantinum Tribunum custodiae civitatis deputavimus praeesse.* Cagliari, Ep. 2, 5, vii. Ind. 2.

[2] Ep. 21, 22, 23, xii. Ind. 7, to the *Mag. Militum* Velox Mauritius, Vitalianus.

the numerous Catholic churches and lands within their territory, he agreed to an amicable peace, and strove to maintain it throughout the year. The intrigues of the Exarch, however, frustrated his intentions, until the negotiations of his own envoy, the Abbot Probus, at length succeeded in obtaining it in 599,[1] the Emperor Maurice meanwhile having apparently invested Probus with full authority for the purpose. The negotiating parties were, on the one side, Agilulf and his dukes, among them—and dangerous to Roman interests—Ariulf of Spoleto; on the other side—and anxious for peace—was the Exarch Callinicus, the successor of Romanus. So great was the esteem in which Gregory was held, that the Lombard King regarded him as an independent power, and sent messengers to Rome, requesting him to sign the treaty of peace. Gregory, however, not wishing through his signature to burthen himself with responsibility, evaded the request. Neither did a Pope in those days recognise himself as more than a priest, who, according to the command of the gospel, was required to avoid temporal dealings and political affairs; the idea of a royal united to a priestly authority being as yet unknown; the theory of the two swords as yet undiscovered.[2] The truce was prolonged until March 601, and was then apparently extended, since later letters contain requests from the Pope that the Magister Militum Maurentius and Duke Arichis of Beneventum would allow the beams,

He makes peace with Agilulf.

[1] Ep. 41, 42, vii. Ind. 2: Letter of thanks from Gregory to Agilulf and Theodolinda.

[2] Ep. 103, vii. Ind. 2, to Theodorus, Curator of Ravenna.

prepared in Bruttium for the basilicas of S. Peter and S. Paul, to be sent by sea.

The doubtful repose which the city now enjoyed was interrupted by the news of a bloody disturbance in Constantinople. The brave Maurice, who had successfully defended the Empire against the Avars, had fallen a victim to a military revolt, and one of the most infamous monsters known to Byzantine history had ascended the throne. The rebel Phocas, a common centurion, stained with the blood of the Emperor and of his five sons, whom, with incredible barbarity, he had caused to be slain in the sight of their father, had ruled in the Palace of Justinian since Nov. 23, 602. The new Emperor hastened to send his own portrait and that of his wife Leontia to Rome, where they arrived on April 25, 603. It was already an old-established custom that each Emperor on his accession should send his own and the Empress's portrait, under an escort of soldiers and flute-players, to the magistrates of the provinces. These likenesses, called "Laurata," apparently because the heads were crowned with laurel, filled the place of the Emperor. The subservient people, in solemn procession, and with lighted tapers, unblushingly met them on their arrival in the city, and, after having done homage to them as to living and god-like beings, placed them on the spot consecrated to their reception.[1] On the present

Phocas Emperor, 602.

[1] With regard to the Laurata, see Baron., *ad Ann.* 603; the Benedictines in the Note to Ep. 1, xi. Ind. 6; and Ducange in the Glossary; also Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengesch. Rom's*, iii[5]. 210. Adrian I. wrote to Constantinus and Irene: *neque enim quando imperialis vultus et imagines in civitates introducuntur, et obviant*

occasion clergy and nobility assembled in the Basilica Julii in the Lateran, and, saluting the arrival of the images with the invocation, "Grant, O Christ, life to Phocas Augustus and to Leontia Augusta," proclaimed the accession of the tyrant. The Pope then commanded the two-fold portrait to be placed in the oratory of the martyr Caesarius in the episcopal palace.[1] Under the title, however, of Basilica Julii, we are given to understand that not a church, but some part of the Lateran Palace is intended.[2] The spot set apart for the solemnisation of the Oath of Allegiance was by no means the ancient Palace of the Caesars, but a hall in the Patriarchium of the Lateran. No imperial official is spoken of as present, nor, in spite of the importance of the occasion, is there any mention of the Senate. On the contrary, it is again the Pope who orders the imperial images to be

*judices et plebes cum laudibus, tabulam honorant, vel supereffusam cera scripturam, sed figuram imperatoris* (in Labbé, *Concil.*, viii. 758).

[1] Ep. I, xi. Ind. 6. *Venit autem icona suprascriptorum Phocae et Leontiae Augustor. Romam VII. Kal. Maii, et acclamatum est eis in Lateranis in basilica Julii ab omni clero et senatu: Exaudi Christe: Phocae Augusto et Leontiae Augustae Vita. Tunc jussit ipsam iconam Dom. beat. et apostol. Gregorius Papa reponi in oratorio S. Caesarii mar. intra palatium.*

[2] Speaking of the Emperor Constans in Rome, the life of S. Vitaliani in the *Lib. Pont.* says: *venit ad Lateranas, et laetus ibidem pransus est in basilica Julii* (read *Julia*), a proof that the hall in question was a triclinium in the ancient Lateran Palace. That this basilica received its name from the Gentile name of the mother of Constantine, Flavia Julia Helena, appears probable. It was identical with the *camera Juliae Imperatricis* mentioned in the *Ordo Rom. ad. coronand. Imperatorem.* Adinolfi, *Roma di Mezzo*, i. 222, ff.

placed in the oratory of a martyr, and this oratory also is found in the Lateran.[1]

Gregory must have shrunk from the very depths of his soul from an Emperor who had waded to sovereignty through streams of blood, but policy compelled him to write submissive congratulations to Phocas and Leontia. He makes heaven and earth rejoice, as if the death of the upright and once friendly Maurice (who had, however, striven to check the growing importance of the Roman bishop through the Patriarch of Constantinople) had removed from Rome some grievous yoke, and the new rule restored freedom and fortune.[2] Only with shame can we read these letters. They constitute the single stain in the life of the great man, and remain to detract from his renown, as the column erected in honour of Phocas remains a monument to the dishonour of Rome.

[1] Baronius erroneously supposes it to have been that of S. Cesario on the Via Appia. There was, however, an Oratorium S. Cesarii in the Vestiarium of the Lateran. Galletti, *del vestarario*, p. 3. Gibbon invents a site in the Palace of the Caesars. His inaccuracy with regard to the topography of the city is pardonable, but how can he have remained in ignorance of the fact that the Church still bestowed canonisation on the Popes even after the days of S. Gregory?

[2] To Phocas, Ep. 38, xi. Ind. 6, in the month of June; to Leontia, Ep. 44, xi.; to Phocas, Ep. 45, xi. Baronius, while blackening the fame of Maurice, excuses Gregory. Muratori's indignation is betrayed in his eulogy of Maurice; Gibbon and Bayle speak the truth. Maimbourg, *Histoire du Pontife St Grégoire* (Paris, 1680), i. 257, flatters Lewis XIV., telling him that Gregory's humility was so exemplary that he wrote, even to a tyrant such as Phocas: "avec tout le respect et toute la soumission qu'un sujet doit à son Prince." The Abbé Fleury merely says elegantly: "ou voit par cette lettre, combien Saint Grégoire était peu content du gouvernement de Maurice."

Column of Phocas.

Gregory had no further share in the erection of this column, which was not placed in the Forum until four years after his death. The unfortunate Romans, above whose heads towered the majestic columns of Trajan and the Antonines, still perhaps bearing on their summits the likeness of those glorious Emperors, were forced by the Exarchs to ask Phocas to bestow the honour of his statue upon their city, and this statue was placed by Smaragdus in the Forum, sideways over against the Triumphal Arch of Septimius Severus. Neither Rome nor art any longer possessed the means of constructing a new column. An antique fluted pillar of the Corinthian order, 78 palms in height, was borrowed from an ancient building, set on a great pedestal, which was erected on steps of four-sided pyramidal construction. The Emperor's statue, of gilt bronze, was placed upon its lofty capital, and unless the artist was an adept in flattery, the Romans could here better view the coarse, misshapen form of the Emperor than they were able to do in S. Cesario. We entertain some doubts, however, as to whether this statue was an actual portrait and the work of a contemporary artist. It is probable that a statue of some earlier Emperor may have received the name of Phocas, and this is all the more likely, because a proceeding of the kind would have been entirely in accordance with Roman tradition, and, further, because no Roman had beheld the Byzantine tyrant. The last public ornament in the style of antiquity, which was erected amid ruins in Rome, was accordingly the statue of Phocas, the monument of Roman servitude to Byzantium.

Accident has preserved this isolated column, and, while the statues and other columns of the Forum which surrounded it have perished without a trace, it has remained upright amid rubbish and decay, exciting for centuries the curiosity of the enquirer, until, on March 23, 1813, its pedestal was uncovered, and its inscription brought to light. The name of the Emperor, together with some of the epithets bestowed upon him by his flatterers, had been erased by the just hatred of the Romans. The column of Phocas still stands in its place, among nameless pedestals from which the statues have long disappeared, and in the midst of a chaos of overthrown marble fragments. Headless, statueless, and alone, it symbolises the life of a despot more fitly than the most eloquent words of a Tacitus could have done.[1]

[1] For the inscription, see Carlo Fea, *Iscrizione di Monum. Publici*, Roma, 1813, p. 4, and *Corp. I. L.*, vi. 1200. Of the Senate there is here no more mention than on Narses' bridge over the Anio. Alongside this pompous inscription it is amusing to read the list of epithets bestowed on the Emperor by Cedrenus : *vinosus, mulierosus, sanguinarius, rigidus*, &c. *Hist. Comp.*, 170.

## CHAPTER III.

1. Character of the Sixth Century—Mohammed and Gregory—Religious Conditions of the Time—Worship of Relics—Belief in Miracles—Gregory Consecrates the Gothic Church of S. Agatha in the Subura.

THE present chapter is, as it were, the reverse side of the picture. If we have hitherto seen in the noble figure of Gregory nothing but the clear light of a penetrating intellect and an unequalled and many-sided energy, we shall now survey him as he stands encompassed by the darkness of his century. His mind was entangled in many a superstition, and his writings have served to diffuse these superstitions over various lands and peoples. Genius may in some matters raise a man above the level of his age; in others it is powerless, and every human intellect must remain subject to the current of the requirements, feelings and conceptions of the time in which it dwells, and by which, as by the atmosphere, it is surrounded.

The sixth century.

The sixth century is one of the most memorable in history. In it mankind survived the collapse of a great and ancient civilisation, and on this account

believed that the end of the world had come. A thick cloud of barbarism, as it were of dust arising from the crash, hung over the Roman Empire, devastated throughout its length and breadth by the destroying angel, dealing pestilence and other ills. The world entered upon a turning point in its development. Upon the ruins of the ancient Empire, amid which the Goths, premature heralds of Germany, had perished, fresh forms of national life now slowly arose. Italy was re-invigorated by the Lombards; Gaul by the Franks; Spain by the Visigoths; Britain by the Saxons. The Catholic Church everywhere constituted itself the vital principle of these growing nations. To the Church they turned as to a centre, and, through the conquest of Arianism, the Church by degrees drew them together in a union which was destined, sooner or later, to give political form to a new Western Empire. These events took place at a time when the East was stirred by a like impulse of development; when Mohammed founded a new religion, which, conquering and uniting nations on the eastern ruins of the Roman imperium, forced the Byzantine Empire first to withdraw from Italy, and then made it a bulwark—heroically defended for centuries—of the West and Hellenic culture. Gregory and Mohammed were the two priests of the West and East. Each founded a hierarchy on the ruins of antiquity, and through the hostile encounter of the two systems the future fate of Europe and Asia was decided. Rome and Mecca, here the Basilica of S. Peter, there the Caaba, became the symbolic temples of the Covenants of the European

and the Asiatic world, while the marvel of the Byzantine Empire, the church built by Justinian to S. Sophia, remained the centre of existing Hellenism.

Is it strange that in a period of chaos and transition such as this the religious imagination was pre-eminently active? When in the crisis of illness all other powers of the mind are suspended, imagination wanders unchecked through the realm of dreams. A mystic excitement, as in the time of Constantine, took possession of society, and in Benedict we have already seen the founder of a new monasticism issuing from Rome. Sick with grievous ills, the mind of mankind sank into the gloomiest extravagances. It is a significant fact, with regard to the religious life of Rome at the time, that in the procession for the plague already described, the goal was the church of the Virgin Mary. Not to the Saviour, but to His mother did the people turn for delivery, a fact which shows that Mariolatry (at the present day the prevailing worship both in Italy and Greece) had already gained the ascendancy. Before the time of Constantine, a like procession, could such have taken place, would have had Christ, the Founder of its religion, as its object. In Vandal and Gothic times it would have turned to the Apostle Peter, but in the seventh century the imagination of the populace was more immediately directed to the mother of Jesus than to the Son, who, represented in the mosaics in severe and terrible majesty, only appeared to the suppliant for mercy under the form of the dreadful Judge of all. Is it too much to assert that the transformation from the

Rise of Mariolatry.

formerly youthful, almost Apollo-like ideal of Christ into the stern and aged figure in the mosaics had contributed to alienate the popular mind from the worship of the Saviour? For a long time past the pure worship of the Divinity had been split up into a new mythology, as, for instance, the worship of saints, the institution of ceremonies, the rite of the Mass, and the pompous forms into which the service of the Church had developed after the age of the Fathers and of the dogmatic struggles with regard to the fundamental teaching of Christianity, had come to an end. Descending from Christ to the Apostles, as the princes of the hierarchy, the reverence of believers had been diverted to the great multitude of martyrs, or champions, for Christ. Their churches filled the towns, their bones and altars the churches. The sensuous Latin race had at all times been incapable of monotheism; and the Romans had no sooner become Christians than they proceeded to fill their city, since ancient times a Pantheon of the gods, with new saints from every province, and their churches with the relics of these saints. Secular learning, criticism, and judgment had vanished and, more than ever, given place to mystic enthusiasm and material worship. Painting alone, an art the importance of which in such an epoch cannot be over-estimated, still maintained a feeble ideal among degenerate mankind.

Worship of the saints.

The worship of relics was as fully developed in the time of Gregory as it is to-day. Chief of all their sacred possessions the Romans boasted that of the remains of the Apostles Peter and Paul, and would

Relics.

have surrendered to the Lombards their city itself rather than any portion of these relics. The Empress Constantina ingenuously implored Gregory to send her the head of the Apostle Paul, or, at any rate, a part of his remains, for the shrine of a church she was building in her palace at Byzantium, and Gregory's answer betrays the difficulty he had in mastering the irritation roused by the request. He replies that it would be a sin worthy of death to touch the sacred bodies, or even to approach them by a glance. He himself had wished to undertake a trifling alteration at the grave of S. Paul, when, as he could assure her, one of the workmen who had ventured to touch some bones, which did not even belong to the body of the Apostle, had been suddenly overtaken by death. Pelagius, he goes on to inform her, while engaged in building the church of S. Lawrence, had opened the grave of the saint, and all the monks and custodians who beheld the corpse had died within ten days. A piece of cloth which had served to cover the tomb, placed in a box, would suffice to show the miraculous powers of the Apostle; and these magnetised rags, called *Brandea,* would he send the Empress, or else a link of the chain of S. Peter, could he succeed in detaching one. The priest, however, to whom such a task was entrusted, was not, he cunningly added, always successful, but often filed at the chain without getting even a little span of it.[1]

The Romans had every reason to guard their relics with a jealous eye, for relics were in great demand. Numerous were the adventurers in search

[1] Ep. 30, iii. Ind. 12.

of treasure, still more numerous perhaps those in search of bones. Men travelling for their own ends, or in the commission of foreign bishops, stealthily ransacked the churchyards to discover the remains of the martyrs, and silently made away with their treasures. The Romans, although guarding the relics of their city better than they did its walls, one day discovered Greeks digging for bones near the Basilica of S. Paul. Proud in the possession of pledges which no other church in the world could share, they beheld in them not only the Palladia of Rome, but also the magnet which should attract pilgrims from every land. When the Pope presented filings from the chains of S. Peter, to which the safety of the city was already ascribed in the sixth century, these were held in the same esteem as the consecrated Golden Rose in a later age. It had become the custom to enclose infinitesimal portions of the chains in golden keys, and to wear these keys as amulets round the neck.[1] Sometimes shavings

[1] Together with Ep. 29, i., Gregory sent to Andreas de Dibiria: *clavem a S. Petri Apost. corpore—quae super aegros multis solet miraculis coruscare: nam etiam de ejus catenis interius habet. Eaedem igitur catenae, quae illa sancta colla tenuerunt, suspensae colla vestra sanctificent.* Arator, in his poem on the history of the Apostles, says at the end of the first book:—

*His solidata fides, his est tibi Roma catenis*
*Perpetuata salus, harum circumdata nexu.*
*Libera semper eris, quid enim non vincula praestent,*
*Quae tetigit, qui cuncta potest absolvere? cuius*
*Haec invicta manu, vel religiosa triumpho*
*Moenia, non ullo penitus quatientur ab hoste,*
*Claudit iter bellis, qui portam pandit in astris.*

Gregory VII. revived the custom of sending S. Peter's keys as

of iron from the fabulous gridiron of S. Lawrence were added, and at others gold crosses enclosing fragments of wood of the true cross. Such crosses and golden keys were esteemed means of defence against illness and every evil.[1] Concerning their sanctity, Gregory himself relates how a Lombard soldier, who desired to alter the form of a cross of S. Peter which he had captured, was punished for his fit of artistic insolence by the blade piercing his throat.[2] The Pope sent amulets only to persons of the most exalted rank, to ex-consuls, patricians, prefects, and kings, as, for instance, Childebert of France, Reccared of Spain, and Theodolinda. Gifts of oil from the lamps burned before the graves of the martyrs were bestowed on distant churches. Cotton steeped in this oil, placed in vases labelled with the title of the saint, was sent to these sanctuaries. Contact with it, as Gregory affirms, sufficed to work miracles, and there were fixed days on which believers were accustomed to anoint themselves with the sacred liquid. It was, on the other hand,

presents. He sent them to Alfonso of Spain, *Reg. Greg.*, vii. 6. A society, calling itself the Brotherhood of Peter's Chains, was formed as late as the year 1866. Never have any chains worn so long as those of S. Peter.

[1] Gregory sent to Queen Theodolinda an amulet in the form of a golden cross, which is still preserved in the Treasury at Monza. The use of amulets was common in Rome from the fourth century. Fish, made of metal and containing relics, were first worn round the neck; also golden *bullae*, as in ancient times; but although cross-shaped amulets were known in Rome in the fourth century, they do not seem to have come into general use until the sixth. De Rossi, *Bullettino di Archeol. Christ.*, Rome, May 1863.

[2] Ep. 23, vi.

the custom to send presents of the oil from the Holy Cross in Jerusalem to Rome.[1]

Gregory, who had refused the head of S. Paul to the Byzantines, had himself brought from the East an arm of the Apostle Luke and another of S. Andrew, to the city, which now strove more eagerly than ever to gather within her walls relics of highest fame. It is said that the Pope had succeeded in discovering the miracle-working robe of S. John the Evangelist, and had it deposited within the Lateran basilica. John the Deacon, three hundred years later, asserted that in his time the tunic still sustained its reputation; that at a period of drought, when shaken outside the doors of the Lateran, it had called down rain; at the time of the inundation it had brought clear skies, and thus the Romans had fortunately been able to replace their *lapis manalis*, or rainstone, which, carried in Pagan times along the Via Appia, had for centuries effected the same results.[2]

Belief in miracles.

With this worship of relics was associated the belief in other superstitions of the time; the appearances of Mary, of Peter, the resuscitation of the dead, the fragrance of bodies, halos round the heads of the

[1] Ep. 34, vii. The ex-Consul Leontius sends him *oleum s. crucis et aloës lignum, unum quod tactu benedicat, aliud quod incensum bene redoleat.* Marini, *Pap. Dipl.*, n. 143, gives a list of the oils of the various martyrs of Rome brought to Monza at the instance of Queen Theodolinda. The document dates from about the year 600. Marini's note, p. 377, and Ducange: Ἔλαιον τοῦ ἁγίου Σταύρου, in his Glossary.

[2] Joh. Diac., *Vita*, iii. c. 58: *vestes—foras excussae.* F. Pagi is not surprised that a coat should work miracles, when the handkerchiefs and girdle of S. Paul had performed them. *Breviar.*, p. 189, xxiv.

saints, visions of demons; all of which beliefs had long found acceptance. It is, nevertheless, surprising to discover these delusions cherished by a man such as Gregory, whose breadth of mind led him to protect the very Jews from the persecution of fanatic bishops. His letters and dialogues betray, however, his belief in all the superstitions of the age; gladly would we esteem these superstitions long-vanquished errors of the imagination, did the evidence of present times allow us to do so. Gregory dedicated the church in the Subura, founded by Ricimer, to S. Agatha of Catania, and here the saint is still worshipped as protectress from the flames of Etna. The Pope's constant intercourse with Sicily undoubtedly explains the adoption of the insular saint into the worship of the city. He desired, moreover, to uproot the last associations of Arianism within Rome, and on this account consecrated the church, the doors of which had long remained closed, to the Catholic faith.[1] He solemnly relates that after the ceremony the devil, in the invisible but yet palpable form of a pig, ran to and fro between the legs of the worshippers until he finally made his exit.[2] During three nights a frightful noise was heard in the rafters, and after the disturbance had ceased a fragrant cloud remained on the altar. We repeat this less as an anecdote than on account of its historic interest. Toleration for the

[1] He terms the church *quondam speluncae pravitatis haereticae*. *Reg.*, iv. 19; Jaffé, n. 1291, p. 161.

[2] *Dialog.*, iii. c. 30. The devil was Arian, and in him Gregory alludes to the Lombards.

Arian faith had expired with the fall of the Goths; the last traces of Gothic rule still clung to the closed churches, several of which had undoubtedly belonged to the Arians, for Gregory tells us that he intended to purify an Arian church beside the Palace Merulana, in the Third Region, and to dedicate it to S. Severinus, for whose relics he had written to Campania.[1] It is needless to add that the belief in hell had long been current, and that the dogma of purgatory (*purgatorius ignis*) dates from the days of Gregory. It is, however, worthy of remark that, although the valley of Gehenna was held to be the especial abode of the lost, other places also bore the reputation of belonging to the lower world. The soul of Theodoric, for instance, was said to have been carried to the volcano of Lipari. The paralytic Bishop Germanus of Capua, sent by his physicians to the baths of Anguli (the present S. Angelo in the Abruzzi), had but just arrived, when he was thrown into no slight dismay by seeing in the midst of the vapour arising from the baths the perspiring soul of the Deacon Paschasius. The ghost assured him that he was undergoing punishment for his heretical assent to the election of the anti-Pope Lawrence.[2]

[1] Ep. 19, ii. Ind. 11. I have not been able to discover any church in Rome dedicated to the celebrated saint of Noricum, whose remains were brought to Naples by his brothers in the time of Odoacer.

[2] *Dialog.*, iv. c. 40. Gehenna is the term adopted by the Fathers of the Church. It is also used by Prudentius, more especially in the singular passage in the *Hamartigenia: avidae nec flamma gehennae Devoret hanc animam mersam fornacibus imis—Esto: cavernoso, quia sic pro labe necesse est Corporea, tristis me sorbeat ignis averno.* He appears to have already an idea of purgatory. In a Deed of Gift (see *Regist. Farfa* in Fatteschi, &c., p. 260) of saec. viii. we read: *uisquis*

2. Gregory's *Dialogues*—Legend concerning Trajan—The Forum Trajanum—State of Learning—Accusations against Gregory—Increasing Ruin of the City—Gregory Attempts to Restore the Aqueducts.

Gregory's *Dialogues.*

The foregoing pages may suffice to confirm our opinion of Gregory and the Romans of his time, and to illustrate a few of the beliefs and delusions prevailing among mankind at the period. The student, however, anxious to pursue the subject more fully may read the *Dialogues* written by the Pope himself; four volumes filled with miraculous histories, related by Gregory to Peter, his faithful deacon, where a word occasionally let fall serves to maintain the form of a dialogue. Written in the fourth year of Gregory's pontificate, few books were read with such eagerness. In copies and translations the *Dialogues* spread over East and West; a version appeared in Arabic at the end of the eighth century, and Alfred of England later rendered them into the Saxon tongue. The editors, members of the congregation of S. Maurus, ascribed the conversion of the Lombards to the influence of these works, and the historian of Italian literature maintains that the contents of the *Dialogues* are of a nature calculated to impress the childish spirit of a barbarous people. In reading

—*metu gehennae aeterna incendia pertimescens.* In the ninth century the poet Saxo says: *sevis tortoribus igne gehenne.* According to Gregory's doctrine, there was a bottomless pit (Infernus) in the earth, divided, as in Dante's poem, into various parts (*poenales loci*). Such as died in the faith were purified by purgatorial fire.

these anecdotes, however, we cannot help wishing that criticism has succeeded in exonerating Gregory from the responsibility of their authorship; being, as we are, forced to acknowledge that the belief in superstitions is thereby directly sanctioned with the authority of an illustrious pope. Their usefulness as a means to conversion is doubtful or transient; their harmfulness is lasting. They, nevertheless, possess a significance which we cannot overlook. These histories were national—Italian and Roman—Gregory only relating such legends as were calculated to increase the fame of Italian saints of his own time, and which, as evidence that the Roman Church was still in possession of miraculous powers, could be used as a weapon against the Arianism of the Lombards. The whole of the second book is dedicated to the acts of Benedict, and thus Gregory sent forth his *Dialogues* as silent missionaries of the Roman Church throughout the provinces.

In return for the many marvellous histories which the great Pope has related, he himself deservedly became the subject of legend. In the eighth century it was believed that one day, when passing the Forum of Trajan, he looked with admiration on this work of Roman greatness. His attention was more particularly attracted by a bronze relief, which represented Trajan, setting forth to battle, in the act of descending from his horse to give audience to a suppliant widow. The widow bewails her son, who had been slain, and demands justice of the Emperor. Trajan promises to judge her case as soon as he has returned from the war. "If thou fallest, however,"

Legend concerning Trajan.

asks the poor widow, "who shall secure me justice?" and the answer that his successor would award it, failing to satisfy her, she prevails on Trajan to dismount and grant her justice on the spot. Gregory saw this incident represented there,[1] and overcome by grief that so just a ruler should be condemned to eternal perdition, wept at the thought all the way to S. Peter's, where, falling into an ecstasy, he heard a voice from heaven telling him that his prayers for Trajan had been heard, that the soul of the Pagan Emperor had been released, but that he must not again attempt to intercede for an unbeliever. Legend further adds that Gregory reanimated the dust of the Emperor in order to baptise his soul; and, the ceremony ended, the body fell to pieces while the soul ascended to heaven.[2]

The audacious idea of a Pagan Emperor, who, by his edict to Pliny, had pronounced Christianity a *religio illicita*, and delivered it over to the persecution

[1] The legend doubtless arose from some relief then existing in the Forum, a province being perhaps represented as a woman supplicating the Emperor. Dio Cassius, 69, 6, relates the incident, but represents the woman as appealing to Hadrian, with whom Trajan seems to have been afterwards confounded.

[2] The legend is given in Joh. Diac., ii. c. 14; Paul. Diac., *Vita*, c. 27; Joh. Damascen. (saec. viii.), *de iis, qui in fide dormierunt*, i. c. 16. The *Mirabilia* transfer the meeting of the widow with the Emperor (whose name is not mentioned) to the *arcus pietatis ante S. Mariam rotundam*. Several *arcus pietatis* are mentioned in the Middle Ages; one in S. Maria in Aquiro, where were a *templum divi Adriani* and *arcus pietatis* (*Mirabilia*), another near S. Pastor on the Esquiline. Gaston Paris has traced the development of the legend in literature. "La Légende de Trajan," 35 fasc. of the *Bibl. de l'école des hautes études*, and Arturo Graf, *Roma nella memorie del medio evo*, 1883, ii. c. 12.

of the State, being placed by one of the holiest of Popes among the blessed in heaven was at variance with the dogmas of the Church. This pretty fable, which arose in the time of Rome's decline, has been severely condemned by Cardinal Baronius, who carefully whitewashes the sainted Gregory from the innocent charge, and demonstrates that the Pope was neither guilty of any compassion for Trajan nor of having ever prayed for a Pagan. The Cardinal might with justice have expressed some doubt as to whether bronze statues remained in the Forum in the days of Gregory, but instead he is so carried away by zeal on this occasion, that he heaps sins mountains high on the soul of Trajan, in order to thrust it back into hell. We shall not, however, trouble ourselves, either with regard to Baronius or to Cardinal Bellarmin, who also, though without fanaticism, rejects the legend, which we have only repeated here as one of the most remarkable reminiscences of the decadence of Rome.[1] It shows us the Romans of the eighth century, as, with enfeebled memory, they looked on the column of Trajan, and told each other wondrous tales of the deeds of their noble Emperor. Thus the legend arose, and spread like some climbing plant on the ruins of the Forum itself.[2]

[1] Bellarmin, *de Purgatorio*, c. 8, tom i. of the controversies.

[2] Amid the reliefs illustrative of humility which Dante beheld in the first circle of purgatory, he found this legend depicted :—

*Quivi era storiata l'alta gloria*
*Del roman prince, lo cui gran valore*
*Mosse Gregorio alla sua gran vittoria :*
*Io dico di Traiano imperadore, &c.*

—*Purgat.*, canto x.

Forum of Trajan.

Of the condition of the Forum of Trajan at this period we are ignorant. In the time of Paulus Diaconus, by whom the legend is related, that is to say in the eighth century, it appears not yet to have fallen into utter ruin.[1] According to two statements made by Gregory's contemporary, Venantius Fortunatus, Bishop of Poitiers, even after the Gothic period, the people were here accustomed to assemble to listen to Homer, Virgil, or some other poet read aloud.

The bishop says:—

> Vix modo tam nitido pomposa poemata cultu
> Audit Trajano Roma verenda foro.
> Quod si tale decus recitasses auri senatus,
> Stravissent plantis aurea fila tuis.

And again:—

> Si sibi forte fuit bene notus Homerus Athenis,
> Aut Maro Trajano lectus in urbe foro.[2]

Although these lines apply as fitly to remote as to more recent times, they might have been quoted by the historian of the Roman Senate in the Middle Ages as evidence of the continued survival of the

[1] Paul. Diacon., *Vita*, c. 27: *quod opere mirifico constat esse constructum*. The Lateran Museum contains two magnificent alto-reliefs from the Forum of Trajan, and another relief containing several figures, among them that of the Emperor, which must have belonged to his triumphal arch, and from which we can form some idea of the beauty of his Forum.

[2] Venant. Fortun., carm. iii. c. 23; vii. c. 8. [But the second passage is hardly evidence of Homer having been recited in Rome at this time.—Translator.]

Council of the Fathers.[1] A modern writer on Italian mediaeval literature has, through their means, been betrayed into the assertion that "at the end of the sixth century Virgil was solemnly read in the Forum of Trajan. Contemporary poets there declaimed their works, and the Senate awarded a piece of cloth of gold to the victor in these literary contests."[2] Although rejecting such literal interpretation of these flowers of rhetoric, we believe also that down to the time of Gregory the custom of reciting poetry in the Forum of Trajan still survived, and are consequently led to inquire into the state of learning at the time.

State of learning.

During the rule of Theodoric and Amalasuntha, we have seen schools in Rome well cared for and provided with teachers paid by the State. The Gothic period is further graced by the last names of eminence in Latin literature, by Boethius and Cassiodorus, the Bishops Ennodius, Venantius Fortunatus, and Jordanes. The writings of these distinguished men show that poetry, history, philosophy and eloquence were still cultivated. The classic poetic art of antiquity had not as yet been banished from the Church, and at the same time (544) that the verses of Virgil were declaimed in the Forum

[1] From the epitaph of Venantius on Bishop Leontius he quotes the following :—

*Nobilitas altum ducens ab origine nomen*
*Quale genus Romae forte senatus habet.*
—Lib. iv. poem. 10, Vendettini *del Sen. Rom.*, p. 17.

[2] Ozanam, *Documents inédits*, &c., p. 6, who borrows the substance of his work from Giesebrecht's dissertation, *De literarum studiis apud Italos*.

of Trajan, the Ex-comes and Sub-deacon Arator might have been heard reading his poem, amid the applause of an appreciative audience, in the Basilica of S. Pietro ad Vincula. The author in this poem renders the history of the Apostles into hexameters by no means barbarous,[1] and in the inscription to Pope Vigilius, to whom it is dedicated, excuses himself by saying that metre is not foreign to Holy Writ, as is shown by the Psalms, and asserts his opinion that the Canticles, Jeremiah and Job had originally been written in hexameters. The muse of Virgil, which visited a sub-deacon in the sixth century, carries him away in some timid recollections, in which Paganism now and then transpires. He makes use of Olympus for the heaven of Christianity, and innocently appeals to the Almighty under the name of Tonans, the ancient God of Thunder. Vigilius accepted these Pagan conceits in 544 with as little reluctance as did Leo X., when, in the sixteenth century, Christendom had become artificially imbued by the forms and ideas of antiquity.[2] Paganism again

[1] Arator, a Ligurian (who died 556 or 560), was *comes domesticorum* under Athalaric, took orders apparently at the time of the siege of Rome under Vitiges, and became sub-deacon. A. Ebert, *Allg. Gesch. der Liter. des Mittelalters* (1874), i. 490, f. He wrote two books in hexameters: *De actibus apostolor* (*Max. Bibl. Veter. Patr.*, t. x.), the first dedicated to S. Peter, the second to S. Paul. Tiraboschi, iii. i. c. x.; Galletti, *del primicerio*, p. 21. Each poem was read aloud seven times in public by its author. Both are found in *Cod. Vatican.*, n. 1665, the end of which, fol. 39, also contains an account of the dedication to Vigilius, and of the public reading of the poems.

[2] These forms never entirely faded from Christian literature; Pagan ideas reappearing in the time of renascence of Charles the Great. Piper, who, in the *Mythologie und Symbolik der Christl. Kunst.*, i. 139,

appears with its ancient metres in the writings of Gregory's contemporary, the celebrated Irish monk Columba, the founder and abbot of the monastery of Bobbio, who died in 615, and who in his works naïvely places Christ alongside of Pygmalion and Danae, Hector and Achilles.[1]

But the Byzantine wars and the fall of the Gothic kingdom, with the overthrow of public institutions, must have involved the burial of the humane sciences. We no longer hear of schools of rhetoric, dialectics and jurisprudence in Rome; that of medicine alone, zealously cherished by Theodoric, may still to some extent have existed. Roman physicians apparently enjoyed a higher reputation than those of Ravenna, since Gregory invited Marianus, bishop of the latter city, to come to Rome to be treated for some chest complaint, from which he suffered.[2]

The cost of education had to be defrayed from the scanty resources provided by private rather than public means. Education could not be entirely neglected, and teachers and pupils of the humane sciences must have always been forthcoming. If we accept the pompous utterances of John the Deacon,

begins with the *Alanus ab Insulis* in the twelfth century, might have supplemented this chapter with examples from the time of Arator.

[1] S. Columbani, "*Poemata Epist. ad Fedolium*," p. 34 (tom. xii. of the *Max. Bibl.*). Both rhyme and assonance already appear in his poem, *de vanitate et miseria vitae mortalis*. The celebrated *Cod. argenteus* of Ulfilas, a treasure probably bestowed on S. Columba by Gothic priests, belonged to Bobbio. It was thence conveyed to Westphalia, and later to Upsala, Castiglioni, "*Ulphilae Gothica Versio Epistolae divi Pauli Mediol.*," 1829, in Carlo Troya, *Cod. Dipl. Long.*, ii. 24.

[2] Ep. 28, ix. Ind. 4.

we are led to believe that, under Gregory's government, Rome was in truth "a temple of wisdom supported by the seven arts, like pillars." Nor among the Pope's companions was there any whose speech or manner was barbarous; on the contrary each and all were versed in Latin literature.[1] The study of the liberal arts again flourished; the learned had no longer to take thought of their lives; the Pope chose as his associates men of the greatest learning rather than those of the highest rank. John Diaconus sketches, in short, in the barbarism of his own century (the ninth) a picture which would have better befitted the later court of Nicholas V. The learned monk laments but one shortcoming; namely, that in Gregory's Curia no one was able to speak Greek. The Pope himself admitted that he did not understand the language, and the fact seems strange, when he had lived so many years as Nuncio at Constantinople, where, although Latin remained the official language and that of the court, he must have heard Greek in daily use. Neither in Byzantium was there any scholar capable of explaining Latin documents, and we are thus enabled to understand how entirely the two cities had become estranged from one another, and how completely Rome was severed from the classic literature of the Greeks.[2] True, John Diaconus ascribes to Gregory

[1] *Togata* and *trabeata latinitas*, says the barbarous monk of Monte Casino in the ninth century. *Vita S. Greg.*, ii. c. 13.

[2] The "barbara eleganza" with which Joh. Diacon. (ii. c. 14) expresses himself is remarkable in his century: *sola deerat interpretandi bilinguis peritia, et facundissima virgo Cecropia* (the Greek language), *quae quondam suae mentis acumina, Varrone caelibatum*

a thorough acquaintance with all liberal discipline, and speaks of the Pope as being so versed in grammar, rhetoric, and dialectics from his childhood that, although in his time, as he expresses it, literary studies flourished in Rome, the Pope, as a scholar, had no rival in the city. The chronicler, however, effaces the brilliancy of his own picture when he tells us in plain terms that Gregory prohibited the reading of Pagan authors to the clergy; he even quotes the notorious passage in the Pope's letter which proves Gregory's hostile attitude towards the humane sciences; where, writing to the Gallic bishop, Desiderius, he tells him he is ashamed to hear that Desiderius had instructed some persons in grammar; speaks of ancient literature as "foolishness," declares it "godless" to set any value upon it, and maintains that there cannot be room in the same mouth for the praise of Christ and that of Zeus.[1] He elsewhere admits that it was not his object to avoid barbarism of style, and that he disdained considering syntax and construction, since he held it unworthy to force the word of God into the rules of Donatus.[2]

Gregory the enemy of the humane sciences.

*suum auferente, Latinis tradiderat, impostorarum sibi praestigia, sicut ipse in suis epistolis quaeritur, vindicabit.* Gregory admits his ignorance: *quamvis Graecae linguae nescius:* Ep. 29, vi. Ind. xv., and Ep. 27, vi.: *hodie in Constantinop. civitate qui de Graeco in Latinum, et de Latino in Graecum dictata bene transferant non sunt.* It is difficult to believe this.

[1] *Quia in uno se ore cum Jovis laudibus Christi laudes non capiunt.* Ep. 48, ix.

[2] *Non barbarismi confusionem devito, situs motusque et praepositionem casus servare contemno, quia indignum vehementer existimo ut verba coelestis oraculi restringam sub regulis Donati.* Epist. ad. Leandrum, as introduction to the *Exposit. Moral. in Libr. Job.*

The first of these passages more especially affords us grounds for asserting that Gregory showed himself hostile towards the humane sciences, but none to maintain that he was himself ignorant or uncultured. His learning was of a theological nature. If he were acquainted with the dialectics of the ancients, a supposition which none of his writings, silent as regards philosophy, encourage, he put away such knowledge from his mind. His works bear the stamp of his time, but his language frequently attains a lofty eloquence, and his Latin is by no means barbarous. His position forced him to confine his influence exclusively to the Catholic life, and while, with incredible mental energy, amid the cares of office and constant ill-health, he found leisure for his theological writings, it were vain to require from either the man or his time the culture of profane literature, or even a recognition of literature as a factor in the education of mankind. The man to whom England owed her conversion beheld Italy still here and there under the spell of the graceful myths of Paganism,[1] but could feel no attachment to the

This admission, on which Brucker, *Hist. Crit. Phil.*, iii. 563, lays great stress, is explained by Tiraboschi, who defends Gregory with great skill. "C'est des tous les papes celui, dont il nous reste le plus d'écrits," says Fleury, *Hist. Eccl.*, viii. 235.

[1] Pagans in Terracina; Greg., Ep. 20, vii.; in Corsica, 2, vii.; in Sicily, 26, iii. In Reggio the Presbyter Sisinnius worshipped an image of one of the gods in his own house (4, x.). The presbyter was probably a lover of the fine arts. There were numbers of Pagans in Sardinia (Ep. 23, &c., iii.), where they were known as Barbaricini; their duke, Hospitio, becoming a convert to Christianity, was rewarded by Gregory with a brief. The toleration of the judices of this island for Paganism could be purchased by money. Ep. 33, iv.

poets of antiquity; and Gregory the bishop must be judged by another standard than Cassiodorus the statesman of classic culture, who incited the monks of his cloister to the study of grammar and dialectics, Gregory was himself the law-giver and director of the pompous ritual of Rome. His biographer extols him as having founded the schools for choristers at S. Peter's and the Lateran; and the school of Gregorian music became the teacher of the West. The earliest papal choir embodied the musical traditions of Paganism, and while Gregory declared war against the poets of the ancient mythology, he tolerated their rhythms in the sacred service of the Mass.[1]

Unfounded accusations brought against Gregory.

In later and even modern times many accusations have been levelled against Gregory; these charges, however, do not admit of proof. It has been said that he suppressed the study of mathematic science. This reproach, however, rests on no other foundation than a passage, wrongly interpreted, of an English writer of the end of the twelfth century.[2] The accusation brought against him by the same

[1] Ozanam, &c., p. 32: *on y enseignait assurément la métrique latine, et les éléments de la langue grecque.* Joh. Diacon. *de eccles. Lateran.*, in Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.*, ii. 571, asserts that the *Antiphonarius* was written by Gregory from the dictation of an angel in the Oratory of the Holy Cross in the Lateran.

[2] John of Salisbury (Polycrat., ii. c. 26): *doctor S. Gregorius—non modo mathesin jussit ab aula recedere, sed, ut traditur a majoribus, incendio dedit probatae lectionis*

*Scripta Palatinus quaecumque tenebat Apollo.*
—Horat., Ep. 3, 1.

*in quibus erant praecipua, quae coelestium mentem, et superiorum oracula videbantur hominibus relevare.* It is evident that by *mathematici* astrologers alone are to be understood.

author, of having burnt the Palatine library, is of graver moment, and it is at least remarkable that in the Middle Ages legend related that the zealous promoter of Catholicism had destroyed the ancient library of Apollo. But the fate of the celebrated library which Augustus had once formed in the portico of the temple dedicated to the Sun-god is completely obscure. It is possible, either that the Greek Emperors may have had its contents conveyed to Byzantium, or that they may have perished in the vicissitudes that had befallen the city; or even that they may have survived, a prey to worms and dust, down to Gregory's own time. In the overthrow of learning the Augustan and Ulpian libraries had perished, and, by degrees, the *Acts of the Martyrs*, the writings of the Fathers, the decrees and letters of the Popes, filled the shelves formerly dedicated to those treasures of Greek and Latin learning, the destruction of which is even more to be regretted than that of the masterpieces of Roman and Athenian sculpture. The first foundation of the Lateran library is ascribed to Hilary, and Gregory also speaks of libraries in Rome and of the archives of the Roman Church, predecessors of the present secret archives in the Vatican.[1]

Since, however, the public monuments of Rome were not the property of the Pope, but of the

[1] Ep. 29, vii., to Eulogius of Alexandria. He here shows that the library of the Church was not yet very complete. Not only the library, but the Papal archives also were to be found in the Lateran in the sixth century, as is evident from the *Liber Diurnus*. De Rossi, *La Bibl. della sede apostolica*, Rome, 1884, p. 28.

Emperor, and since it is utterly impossible to conceive that the Emperor would have sanctioned the wanton destruction of the greatest library in the city, we cannot forego the attempt to clear Gregory's memory from such an outrageous act of barbarism. And if there be any truth in the report that the Pope swore especial vengeance on the works of Cicero and Livy, and destroyed their codices wherever he found them, it may in some degree console us to know that, by a happy accident, Cardinal Mai was enabled to rescue the books of Cicero's *Republic* from the grave of the Roman Middle Ages.[1]

The advocates of the great Pope are placed in a still greater difficulty by another no less serious accusation, namely, that Gregory, in his Catholic zeal, destroyed the ancient monuments of Rome, not only with the view of uprooting the last remains of Paganism, but also in order to prevent the eyes of the pilgrims who flocked to the churches and graves of the saints from being attracted to the beauteous works of antiquity. Two ignorant chroniclers in the fourteenth century, a Dominican and an Augustinian monk, relate with satisfaction how the Pope struck off the heads of the statues of the ancient gods and mutilated their limbs.[2] A

[1] The work was discovered in a palimpsest, that had belonged to the monastery of Bobbio. See the preface to *M. Tullii Ciceronis De republica quae supersunt.*, Romae, 1822.

[2] "Leonis Urbevetani Chron.," *Deliciae Eruditor.* of Joh. Lamius, v. 104: *et ne erroris antiqui semen de cetero pullularet, imaginibus Daemonum capita et membra fecit generaliter amputari*—a precious idea of this general amputation of the statues. Amalricus Augerius also extols Gregory for this deed. Muratori, iii. 2, p. 55.

biographer of the Pope at the end of the fifteenth century further recounts how Sabinian, the successor of Gregory, during a famine stirred up the people against the memory of the late Pope, reminding them that he had destroyed the monuments of antiquity throughout the entire city. It was even asserted that he had thrown the statues promiscuously into the Tiber.[1] This accusation, however, which found acceptance not only among Protestants, but also among numerous Catholics, is incapable of proof. Gregory must naturally have been indifferent to the beautiful creative art of the ancients, but our sympathy leads us to adopt the views of such writers as point to his love for Rome, to the Emperor's right over all public works, and to the number of monuments which survived his days, as arguments in his defence. Nevertheless, we recognise a certain amount of justice in the assertion made against him in general. The reproach of Vandalism is one shared by many Popes in common with the barbarians, and the destruction of many a beautiful statue is undoubtedly due to the pious zeal of one or other bishop.[2]

The city sank hopelessly day by day into ever

[1] Platina in the life of Sabinianus.

[2] Bargaeus, a barbarian, like Leo of Orvieto, justifies Gregory for having, as he believes, destroyed statues and temples; he holds the opinion that the Romans themselves, at the instigation of the Pope, had destroyed their city. Platina, Tiraboschi, Bandini, and, with most success, Fea, have exonerated Gregory. Bayle takes the imputations for what they are worth. Brucker, iii. 560, and in the appendix, though entertaining doubts of these acts of Vandalism, has made the Pope the object of a violent attack.

deeper ruin. Gregory, who looked with indifference on the destruction of the temples, regarded with grief the broken aqueducts, which must inevitably perish did not the city provide for their restoration. He wrote repeatedly to John the sub-deacon, his Nuncio in Ravenna, earnestly entreating him to intercede with the Prefect of Italy for their restoration. He implored the latter to entrust the charge to the Vice-comes Augustus, who, it appears, was endowed from Ravenna with the ancient title of Count of the Aqueducts. Nothing further, however, took place. The aqueducts were consigned to ruin, and, with the exception perhaps of some slight attempt at restoration, no single aqueduct was put into working order.[1]

Generally speaking, during the reign of Gregory it is only when dealing with churches or convents that the historic names of Rome obtain a casual mention; the monuments of antiquity are already veiled in the shadows of an ever-deepening night.[2]

[1] Ep. 24, xii.: *quatenus cura formarum comitti Augusto evic-comiti debuisset. Nam sic despiciuntur atque negligentur formae ipsae, ut nisi major sollicitudo fuerit, intra paucum tempus omnino depereant.* The letter belongs to the year 602.

[2] Gregory speaks of the Thermae of Agrippina, where he founded a convent; again of a *Taberna juxta Pallacenas*, Ep. 44, v. The Thermae of the wife of Germanicus stood in the valley of S. Vitale, where their remains may still be seen. The spot called Pallacenae near S. Marco is already known to us. The names of the ancient city gates only once appear in Gregory's writings: Ep. 44, xi.

### 3. GREGORY'S ACTIVITY IN ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS—HIS EFFORTS TO UNITE THE GERMAN WEST WITH ROME—CONVERSION OF ENGLAND—DEATH OF THE POPE, 604—HIS MONUMENTS IN ROME.

We must here restrict ourselves to dealing with the influence which the great bishop exercised on the city of Rome, and leave it to ecclesiastical history to describe the importance of his reign on matters belonging to the Church. When he succeeded to the Papacy, the long centuries of struggle which established the structure of ecclesiastical doctrine had passed away, the fundamental dogmas of the Catholic faith, the Trinity and the nature of Christ were already fixed. The age of the Fathers had ended, and a new era had begun, in the course of which the East became separated from the West, and the absolute power of the Roman Pope gained full development. His predecessor Leo, having already attained in principle the recognition of the primacy of the Apostolic chair, Gregory ushered in the new era and laid the foundations of Papal dominion. This primacy was indefatigably contested by the oriental dioceses of Antioch and Alexandria, and still more indefatigably by Constantinople, whose Patriarch, John Jejunator, adopted on his side the title of Oecumenical or Universal bishop. Gregory, however, resolutely opposed the assumption of the rival prelate, while with shrewd humility he, first among the Popes, adopted that of "Servant of the Servants of God."[1]

Supremacy of the Apostolic chair.

[1] *Servus Servorum Dei*, Joh. Diacon., ii. c. 1. The title *Papa*

The strained relations between the Papacy and the East, increased with time into an irreparable breach, and enabled the West to attain an independence, essentially due to the union of the Roman Church with the Germans. The power of the Greek Church was at the same time lessened, her patriarchates, the oldest foundations of Christianity, being for the greater part swallowed up by Islam.

To Gregory was also due the extension of the jurisdiction of the Roman See far beyond the boundaries of his patriarchate in the West. According to the limits established by Constantine, the Bishop of Rome possessed spiritual jurisdiction over the ten suburban provinces of Italy subject to the *Vicarius Romae.* The Metropolitan of Ravenna, however, in the Aemilian and Flaminian territories, that of Milan in Liguria, the Cottian Alps, and the two Rhaetias, and the Archbishop of Aquileja in Venetia and Italy, disputed the Apostolic power of the Roman Bishop within their respective territories. Gregory, however, opposed to these claims the supremacy of the successor of S. Peter, and constituted himself essentially Patriarch of the West.[1] At the same time he also brought the Teutonic

(πάππας) was at this time bestowed on other bishops also. The first to apply it to the Roman bishop, to the exclusion of other prelates, was Ennodius of Ticinum, about the year 510. See note in Gieseler, i. 437. From the seventh century onwards, the title was fixed for the Roman bishop, but not until the time of Gregory VII. did custom become law. The title of *pontifex maximus* was already in use in the days of Leo I.

[1] Besides the churches of Italy the Roman bishop possessed patriarchal authority over Illyria and Africa.

Churches in Gaul and Spain, where the Visigothic King Reccared, with his subjects, had been converted to the Catholic belief, into closer relations with the Roman See; while the gradual conversion of the hitherto chiefly Arian Lombards, due to the pious zeal of Queen Theodolinda, secured the unity of faith in Italy.[1]

Conversion of England.

Gregory, as "Consul of God," also conquered for Rome the distant island of Britain.[2] It is related that one day before he became Pope, seeing three beautiful boys in the slave market of the Forum, and informed of their nationality, he cried: "Angles, like angels are they."[3] He released the homeless children and, seized with the "Apostolic spirit," wished himself to go as missionary to the island; but being detained by his fellow-citizens, not until 596 was he able to send from his monastery a band of monks, under the leadership of Augustine, to the distant isle once ruled by Rome. The success of the missionaries was great. Britain, abandoned two hundred years before by the Empire, and then conquered by the powerful English race, through the agency of a solitary monastery beside the Colosseum, became incorporated with the orthodox

[1] On Gregory's relations with the German Church, which stood in but lax connection with Rome, see G. Lau, *Gregor I. der Grosze nach seinem Leben und seiner Lehre*, Leipzig, 1846, p. 179.

[2] *Ad Christum Anglos convertit pietate magistra Adquirens fidei agmina gente nova—Hisque Dei consul factus laetare triumphis.* Thus it is written in Gregory's epitaph.

[3] *Angli quasi Angeli.* Beda, *Histor.*, ii. c. 1, and Joh. Diacon., *Vita*, i. c. 21. Gregory sent the Presbyter Candidus to Gaul to buy English boys for service in the monasteries.

Roman Church, as a new province filled with zeal for the faith. Gregory, recalling old associations, named King Adelbert and his wife Adelberga the new Constantine and the new Helena.[1]

The powerful individuality of this single man, the greatest of his century, thus succeeded in penetrating distant countries and peoples, and in making Rome honoured and respected. He confronted Kings and Emperors with dignity, enjoined justice towards their subjects, and exhorted them to mild government. He protected individuals and also provinces against the oppression of Imperial officials; his quick ear heard the cries of complaint from savage Corsica and distant Africa.[2] Never has a Pope more highly understood his mission, or more successfully fulfilled it. His care and correspondence embraced all the countries of Christendom. Never has any pontiff left behind a greater mass of writings than he who has been named the last of the Fathers, nor has any greater or more noble spirit ever filled S. Peter's chair. After a truly glorious reign, during which he founded the supremacy, destined to last a thousand years, of the Roman bishop over the Western Church, Gregory died in Rome on March 12, 604.[3]

[1] Ep. 59, 60, ix., and the letter of introduction which the Pope gave to the monk Augustine: 52, &c., v. As to the way in which Gregory adapted himself to Paganism, we are instructed by Ep. 71, ix., in which he commands the Pagan temples to be consecrated as churches, and a meal to be given to the baptised, on the festival of the martyrs, in cabins formed of branches ranged round the churches.

[2] Ep. 59, i., to the Exarch of Africa. The Corsicans were oppressed to such a degree by the Greek officials that they even sold their own children. Ep. 3, vi.

[3] He was buried in S. Peter's, where a good inscription was later

Monuments of Gregory.

Few monuments endure to preserve his memory in Rome; the misery of the time either did not permit him to adorn his native city with buildings, or, intent solely on the salvation of mankind, he disdained, according to the expression of the monk Beda, to trouble himself like other bishops about the outward splendour of the churches, resplendent in gold and silver. The *Liber Pontificalis*, so rich in catalogues of the buildings and votive gifts of his predecessors, only mentions, in the curiously brief notice that it gives of Gregory's reign, that he dedicated a Ciborium with four silver pillars to the Apostle Peter, that is to say, a *baldacchino* over the high altar, called also *fastigium*. We are informed in his letters that he ordered beams from Calabria in order to undertake restorations in S. Peter's and S. Paul's, but it is doubtful whether these were ever really carried out. The foundation of his monastery on the Clivus Scauri has already been mentioned. Had the portraits, which were painted by his command in the atrium of the monastery, escaped destruction, they would assuredly have been of importance in the history of art. John the Deacon, who saw these paintings, has described them in detail. Executed in fresco, they prove that painting in colours was still practised in schools at the time. S. Peter was represented on a throne. Before him, and holding his right hand, stood Gordian, the father of Gregory, wearing the dress of a deacon, a chestnut-brown

placed in his honour. This was composed by Petrus Oldradus, Archbishop of Milan, and Secretary of Adrian I. Cancellieri *de secretariis vet. Basil. Vaticanae*, p. 669.

chasuble over the dalmatic, his feet encased in small boots. His face was long and serious, with a short beard, his hair thick, and his eyes animated. Another picture represented Gregory's pious mother as a noble matron of the time. Silvia was wrapped in a white veil-like garment, whose folds passed from the right shoulder over the left, in ancient Roman fashion. A white tunic fastened round the throat, and falling in large folds to her feet, was decorated with two stripes like a dalmatic, and a white mitra or hood covered her head. With the fingers of the right hand she apparently made the sign of the cross, while her left held a prayer-book on which was written: "My soul lives and will praise thee, and thy signs will help me." *Vivit anima mea et laudabit te, et indicia tua adjuvabunt me.* John the Deacon looked with reverence on the picture, and found that even age had not availed to dim the traces of her earlier beauty. Although the round white face was seamed with wrinkles, the great blue eyes under their soft brows, the sweet lips and the serenity of her mien bore witness to the happiness her heart experienced in having given such a son to the world.

Gregory himself was depicted on a circle of stucco in the little apse,—a pleasing figure of mild aspect,—with a brownish beard. His forehead was bald, high and broad, surrounded with scanty black hair; the expression of his face was gentle, and his biographer tells us that his beautiful hands, with their rounded fingers, denoted dexterity in writing. A chestnut-brown chasuble hung over the dalmatic, and the

pallium, marked with the cross, fell over his shoulders, breast and sides. No nimbus surrounded his head; a square frame instead, behind it, showed that the portrait was painted during the life-time of the Pope; the circular glory, the emblem of sainthood, being only used in the case of the departed.[1]

The monastery of S. Andrew has perished. A hundred years after Gregory's death, deserted by the monks, it was restored by Gregory II., and the period of its later ruin is uncertain. It is said that Gregory's church, the date of which, however, is unknown, occupies the site of the earlier building.[2] Here, as also in the adjoining chapel, monuments still endure to commemorate the history of the noblest of all popes. An artistic Ciborium, the gift of an abbot of the year 1469, stands in the Salviati chapel. On it is depicted the procession filing past Hadrian's mausoleum, with the angel hovering above. In Gregory's chapel a fine relief on the front of the altar, apparently of the same period, shows the Pope in prayer for the release of souls in purgatory; the legend relating to Trajan is not, however, represented.

Baronius, formerly Commendator of the Camaldolese Monastery near S. Gregorio, was the founder of

[1] Joh. Diacon., *Vita*, iv. c. 83, 84. Of Gregory's eyes, he says: *oculis pupilla furvis non quidem magnis sed patulis—furvis* has been, wrongly perhaps, altered into *fulvis*. Bayle says there was in Gregory *le fond de toutes les ruses et de toutes les souplesses dont on a besoin pour se faire de grands protecteurs et pour attirer sur l'Eglise les bénédictions de la terre.* Angelus Rocca wrote a treatise on these portraits (tom. iii. of the edition of the Maurists).

[2] It was rebuilt in 1633 by Cardinal Scipio Borghese. Mariano Armellini, *Le chiese di Roma*, Rome, 1887, p. 291.

three chapels close to the church, dedicated respectively to S. Andrew, S. Silvia, and S. Barbara. The first, probably erected on the spot where Gregory had previously built a church to the Apostle, is decorated with paintings by Domenichino and Guido Reni. The faded splendour of these frescoes, where nothing commemorates the life of the Pope, attracts the beholder less than the inferior work of an unrenowned artist in the chapel of S. Barbara depicting the conversion of England.

## CHAPTER IV.

1. Pontificate and Death of Sabinian — Boniface III.—Boniface IV.—Dedication of the Pantheon to the Virgin Mary.

Sabinian Pope, 604-606.

On the death of Gregory, the chair of Peter remained vacant for half a year, until the arrival of the ratification of his successor. This was Sabinian of Volterra, previously deacon and Nuncio of the Roman Church at Constantinople. He entered on his office amid the most disastrous circumstances, Rome and the whole of Italy being visited at the time by a terrible famine.[1] The Pope, it is true, threw open the granaries of the Church, but the supplies did not suffice to meet the needs of the populace. They now even execrated Gregory's memory, accusing him of having squandered the revenues of the Church. A childish legend related that the angry spirit of Gregory appeared to his successor, and, overwhelming him with reproaches, finally struck him on the head, and that Sabinian died shortly after.[2] It would appear that Sabinian was regarded by many Romans as hostile to the memory

[1] Paul. Diacon., *Vita*, c. 23, and *de Gest. Long.*, iv. c. 29.
[2] Siegbert, *Chron. ad. Ann.* 607.

of his predecessor, and envious of his renown. He died in February 606, apparently during a revolt of the populace, and since his remains were conveyed from the Lateran to S. Peter's by a circuitous route round the walls of the city, it would appear that the dead Pope himself had to dread the fury of the famished mob. That his death, however, was due to violence, is not asserted.

Boniface III., 607.

The Apostolic chair remained empty an entire year, until Phocas confirmed the election of the Roman, Boniface III., son of John Kataaudioces, whose name points to a Greek ancestry. The brief reign of this Pope is devoid of importance; the chroniclers merely record that he obtained from the Emperor Phocas a decree by which the dispute concerning supremacy between the Bishop of Rome and the Patriarch of Constantinople was brought to a successful issue. The Greek Emperor declared that Rome henceforward was to be regarded as the Apostolic head of Christendom. Boniface III. died, according to the ecclesiastical writers, on November 10, 607. On September 15 of the following year, Boniface IV., a Marsian from Valeria, became Pope.[1]

Boniface IV., 608–615.

His reign of more than six years was rendered troublous owing to famine, pestilence, and pressure from the enemy. We may imagine how rapidly deserted Rome fell to decay. Nevertheless, under this Pope one of the grandest buildings of the city emerges from the darkness in which for centuries it had lain shrouded. The vast Field of Mars, although filled with magnificent buildings of every kind, had

[1] Jaffé, *Reg. Pont.*, p. 220.

never at any time been thickly populated, its halls, baths and temples, its stadia, theatres and groves, having merely served for the amusement of the people. The churches, however, which had arisen, collected new life around them, serving in the more deserted regions of the city, as did others in the desolate districts of the Campagna, as centres round which a fresh population clustered. Of the numerous churches within the city, two only had been built in the Campus Martius, and these at its extremest outskirts,—S. Laurentius in Lucina, and in Damaso; while the centre of the district contained only some little oratories. The Pantheon stood surrounded by great marble buildings, which, in 590, had suffered severely from inundations of the Tiber. Around it towered the Baths of Agrippa, of Nero, or Alexander, the temple of Minerva Chalcidica and the Iseum, the Odeum and the Stadium of Domitian, and while on one side stood the lordly buildings of the Antonines, the Theatre of Pompey and the adjacent colonnades rose on the other. All these splendid buildings, although abandoned to decay, old and weather-beaten, had scarcely yet completely fallen to ruin.

The Pantheon.

The Pantheon, the most beautiful monument of Agrippa, had already bid defiance to the elements for more than six hundred years. Neither the inundations of the Tiber, which, even at the present day, rises almost yearly, overflowing the floor of the rotunda, nor the rains of winter pouring down through the opening of the cupola on its marble floor, and collected in subterranean channels, had availed to shake the firmness of its walls. Its

magnificent porch, approached by five steps, with sixteen granite columns, surmounted by Corinthian capitals of white marble, stood unimpaired. The statues of Augustus and Agrippa, placed there by the latter, still perhaps remained in their original niches. Time was powerless to injure the rafters of gilt bronze, nor had any spoilers as yet laid hands on the metal tiles, with which portico as well as cupola were covered.[1] Whether the pediment still retained its ornament, of which, however, no description has remained, we do not know. Adjoining the Thermae, the Pantheon could not originally have served as a temple, but the construction of the vestibule by Agrippa, during his third consulate, proves that it was even thus early destined to serve the purposes of Pagan worship. Already Pliny had bestowed upon it the name of Pantheon, and within the building Dion Cassius had beheld, beside the statues of Mars and Venus, those also of the deified Caesars with whom Augustus refused to have his name associated.[2] These statues show that, although

[1] Urban VIII. (Barberini) despoiled the roof of its supports, which he melted into cannon and into pillars for the cover of the high altar in S. Peter's. His act of Vandalism was avenged by the immortal squib: *quod non fecerunt Barbari, fecerunt Barberini.*

[2] The earliest Roman document in which the name *Pantheum* occurs dates from the year 59, during the reign of Nero. This is an Arval table, found in 1866 on the spot sacred to the *Dea Dia* on the road to Portus. The *Fratres Arvales* there record that they were accustomed to assemble *in Pantheo*, whence it follows that the building of Agrippa was used thus early for religious purposes. De Rossi, *Bullett.*, 1866, n. 4. [On the history of the building, see R. Lanciani, *Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*, 1897, p. 476, ff.—TRANSLATOR.]

the temple received its title in general from Cybele, the mother of the gods, and in particular from Jupiter Ultor, in remembrance of the great victory of Augustus at Actium, the ulterior idea was that of doing honour to the Caesars.[1] The edicts of the Christian Emperors had commanded all temples to be closed, and although Visigoths and Vandals had undoubtedly burst open the great doors with their plates of bronze,—scarcely those of the present day,—no Roman perhaps had crossed the threshold of the Pantheon for two hundred years. Treasures in the building the barbarians could not have discovered, nor were the polished marble panellings nor the *cassette* of the roof, adorned with metal rosettes, sufficient to attract their cupidity. But the images of the neglected gods still stood in the six niches of the interior, as also in the aedicula between, and although some of these statues were still found in the building in the time of Boniface IV., the more valuable had probably already become the spoil of the invader.[2]

The Pope looked with longing eyes on this marvel of ancient art, fitted so admirably for the purposes

[1] Dio Cassius, liii. 27, ingeniously explains the name Πάνθειον, ὅτι θολοειδες ὄν, τῷ οὐρανῷ προσέοικεν. Plin., *Hist. Nat.*, xxxvi. 24, 1 : *Pantheon Jovi Ultori ab Agrippa factum.* Pietro Lazeri, *della Consecrazione del Panteon*, Roma, 1749, xii., maintains that the building was neither a temple nor regarded as such by the Christians (viii.); he is, however, refuted by Fea, *Sulle Rovine*, note c. p. 284.

[2] A drawing in the Barberini Gallery, representing the interior of the Pantheon, due to Giuliano da S. Gallo, a contemporary of Raffaelle, shows the ancient pedestals in the aedicula, on which stood the images of the gods. Passavant, *Rafael von Urbino*, i. 322.

of a church. The circular building, which stood on an open space, and differed in form from the usual architecture of a temple, seemed to invite him to take possession; and the beautiful cupola, a sphere rising into the air, through which the light of heaven streamed, appeared to him to offer a fitting dwelling for Mary, Queen of Heaven. The later Emperors had issued edicts, forbidding the destruction of the Pagan temples, and commanding instead the consecration of all such buildings to the uses of Christianity; and this order, with regard at least to Britain, Gregory had sanctioned by his directions to Bishop Melitus.[1] The system which already prevailed in ancient Athens, where the Parthenon, the seat of the virgin Athene, had been converted into a church to the Virgin Mary, was but tardily adopted in Rome.[2] Nothing more clearly proves that the Pope possessed no rights over the ancient buildings in the city than the significant remark of the chroniclers, that Boniface begged the Emperor Phocas to grant him the use of the Pantheon, and that the Pope received the building as a gift.[3] The relations of

Consecrated as a church.

[1] Ep. 71, ix. Indict. 4.

[2] The *Anonym. Viennensis*, ed. Ludwig Ross, Vienna, 1840 (n. 11), calls the Parthenon *ναὸς τῆς θεομήτορος*, and he adds the idle tale: *ὃν ᾠκοδόμησαν ἀπολλὼς καὶ εὐλόγιος ἐπ' ὀνόματι ἀγνώστῳ θεῷ*. The temple of Baal at Heliopolis, converted into a church about 391, is the first instance of a transformation of this kind. Gottfried, Commentar. in Cod. Theodos., xvi. tit. 10.

[3] *Lib. Pont.* in Bonif. IV.: *Hic petiit a Phocate Principe templum, quod Pantheon vocabatur; quod fecit ecclesiam beat. ac glorios. et Dei genitricis semperq. Virginis Mariae, et omn. Martyr. Christi.* Paul. Diacon., *de G. Long.*, iv. c. 37: *Idem alio Papa Bonifacio petente jussit in vetere fano, quod Pantheon vocabant, ablatis idololatriae*

the Roman Church with Byzantium must consequently have been of a friendly nature, the same Emperor having but a short time before (in 608) erected his column in the Forum.

Boniface assembled the clergy of the city; the doors of the Pantheon, to which the cross had been affixed, were opened, and, for the first time, a procession of Christian priests, chanting their liturgy, entered the lofty rotunda. While the Pope sprinkled the walls, from which the symbols of Paganism had been removed, with holy water, and the vaulted roof echoed back the strains of the Gloria in Excelsis, the Romans, in imagination, may have beheld the affrighted demons seeking exit by the opening in the roof. The evil spirits were as numerous as the gods of Paganism, and down to the time of Boniface the Pantheon had been regarded as their peculiar stronghold. The later Middle Ages, aware that the building had been dedicated by Agrippa to Cybele and all the gods, believed that the gilt statue of the goddess had been placed over the opening of the cupola.[1] Legend of the twelfth century may well have been the popular belief of six hundred years

*sordibus. Ecclesiam b. semp. virg. Mariae, et omn. martyrum fieri, ut ubi quond. omnium non deorum, sed daemonum cultus erat, ibi deinceps omn. fieret memoria sanctorum.* Bede likewise narrates the occurrence.

[1] *Mirab. Romae*, and *Graphia aureae urbis R.*, which adds: *in hujus autem templi fastigio stabant duo tauri erei deaurati.* Both mention Neptune in addition to Cybele. Leo of Orvieto drew from the "Mirabilia" in the *Chron. Pontific.* See Lamius, &c., iv. 107; he also speaks of Mars. *Martyrolog. Romanum*, with the note of Baronius on the 13th of May; Ado, *Chron.* and *Martyrologium*, and Usuard.

earlier, and that the Pantheon was held to have been specially dedicated to Cybele may reasonably be inferred from the fact that Boniface dedicated it to the Virgin and all the Martyrs, the Christian Church preferring to install in the temples converted to the uses of her faith such saints as most fitly corresponded to the deities they supplanted. Thus the temple supposed to have been dedicated to the twin brothers, Romulus and Remus, was consecrated to the twins Cosma and Damian. S. Sabina took the place of the goddess Diana on the Aventine, and George and Sebastian, the canonised military tribunes, that of the war-god Mars. Boniface, in accordance with tradition, banished the great mother Cybele in order to make way for the new Magna Mater, and the Temple of all the Gods was transformed into a church dedicated to all the martyrs. The claim of universality made by the Roman faith in the city, which embraced within its walls Christian saints of every land, thus found appropriate expression in the Christian Pantheon, and there can be little doubt that Boniface despoiled the catacombs of whole waggon-loads of bones, in order to provide the shrine of his new sanctuary with relics of so-called martyrs.[1]

According to the *Martyrologium Romanum*, the Pantheon was consecrated on the 13th May, but statements as to the year vary between 604, 606,

[1] Ugonio, *le stazioni*, p. 313, speaks of twenty-eight carts; others of only eighteen, which is, nevertheless, a by no means insignificant number. Baronius, from a manuscript belonging to the church, reckons with satisfaction thirty-two waggons filled with bones.

609, 610.[1] The anniversary of dedication is still celebrated in Rome, and the Feast of All Saints commemorated on the 1st, that of All Souls on the 2nd November. Whether, however, these days were set apart by Boniface, or whether this was not done until the time of Gregory IV., we do not know. For not until the ninth century did the festival, originally Roman, obtain recognition from the nations on the other side the Alps.[2] The Rotunda of Agrippa thus gave birth to the festival of mourning, universal throughout Christendom, and from the Pantheon of all the Gods proceeded the spirit of gentle melancholy and pious remembrance, which, down to latest times, has inspired the musical genius of both Italy and Germany to some of its most beautiful creations. The Pantheon became the Temple of Piety and Rest, and even yet we cannot cross the threshold of this incomparable building without reverent emotion. The finest architectural monument of ancient Rome has to thank the Church, which hallowed it to Christian uses, for its preservation from the spoiler. Had this transformation not taken place, the splendid building would undoubtedly have been converted into the fortress of some noble in the Middle Ages, and, after having undergone assaults innumerable, would have survived, like the tomb of Hadrian, only in ruinous and mutilated guise. On account of this single deed, Boniface IV.

[1] Ado, *Vienn. Chron.*, 604; Herm., *Contractus*, 609; Siegbert, *Chron.*, 609; *Annal. Monastar.*, 609; Marianus Scotus, 610; Jaffé, *Reg. Pont.*, 2nd ed. p. 220.

[2] Baron., Annotat. to the *Martyrol. Rom.*, 1 November.

has been judged worthy the title to immortality, to which the inscription on his tomb lays claim.[1] On the score of its antiquity, its beauty, and its sanctity, the new church has always been esteemed by the Romans the most precious ornament of their city, and, from the seventh century onwards, remained the zealously-guarded property of the Popes. Even in the thirteenth century, every senator was obliged to swear that, together with S. Peter's, the Castle of S. Angelo, and the other papal possessions, he would also defend S. Maria Rotondo for the Pope.[2]

2. DEUSDEDIT POPE, 615—REVOLTS IN RAVENNA AND NAPLES—EARTHQUAKES AND LEPROSY IN ROME—REBELLION OF THE EXARCH ELEUTHERIUS IN RAVENNA—BONIFACE V. POPE—HONORIUS I., 625—RIGHT OF CONFIRMING THE PAPAL ELECTIONS DEVOLVES ON THE EXARCH—BUILDINGS OF HONORIUS I.—S. PETER'S—SPOLIATION OF THE ROOF OF THE TEMPLE OF VENUS AND ROME—CHAPEL OF S. APOLLINARIS—S. ADRIANO IN THE FORUM.

Boniface IV. died in May 615, and five months later the Roman Deusdedit, son of the sub-deacon

[1] *Gregorio Quartus, jacet hic Bonifacius almus*
*Huius qui sedis fuit aequus Rector et aedis,*
*Tempore, qui Focae cernens Templum fore Romae*
*Delubra cunctorum fuerunt quae Daemoniorum*
*Hoc expurgavit sanctis cunctisque dicavit.*

This barbarous inscription may still be read in the Crypt of the Vatican.

[2] *Juramentum Senatorum Urbis* in the *Ordo Roman.* of Cencius Camerarius, Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.*, ii. 215: *nominatim autem sanctum Petrum, urbem Romanam, civitatem Leoninam, Transtyberim, insulam, castellum Crescentii, Mariam Rotundam.*

Deusdedit I. Pope, 615–618.

Stephen, was elected Pope. These events took place in the sixth year of the reign of the great Emperor Heraclius, who, having deprived the tyrant Phocas of throne and life, had carried his arms into the heart of Persia, and in the first year of that of Adelwald, who had succeeded his father Agilulf on the throne of the Lombards. Although the Lombards were still at peace, the Oriental war had its influence on the affairs of the Exarchate, where the nationalities of Latin and Greek came into ever harsher collision. A revolution broke out in Ravenna, the first of the kind of which history gives any tidings; the Exarch John Lemigius was slain, and the disturbance was only quelled by his successor, Eleutherius. With this revolt was allied a rebellious movement in Naples, or else the unsettled state of the times had been sufficient to call the latter movement into being. John of Compsa, a respected burgher of that city, of whom we hear towards the end of the Gothic war, rebelled against the Byzantine government, and succeeded in making himself master of Naples. His action compelled Eleutherius, with an army, to leave Ravenna. Advancing to Rome, he was received with every honour by Deusdedit, conquered Naples, put the rebels to death, and returned victorious to Ravenna, probably in 616 or 617.[1]

[1] *Liber Pont.*, Deusdedit. According to Marquard Freher's *Chronology of the Exarchs* (*apud Joh. Leunclavium Jus Graeco-Roman.*, Francf., 1596, t. i.), Joh. Lemigius was the fifth Exarch. The Exarchs succeeded each other in the following order: Longinus, Smaragdus, 584; Romanus, 587; Callinicus, 598; Smaragdus *iterum*, 602; Joh. Lemigius, 612; Eleutherius, 616. Like the Lombard Kings, the Exarchs adopted the name of Flavius.

The *Liber Pontificalis*, the sparse and only source of our history, remarks that peace was herewith restored throughout the entire country. In the meanwhile, with the seventh century, the affairs of Italy shaped themselves anew. The Latin nation, strengthened through the Church, appeared in determined opposition to Greek rule, while the Byzantine governors, on their side, strove to attain independence. The Roman Church became the champion of these national movements, and, on the ground of dogmatic differences, herself entered into a violent contest with the Greek idea of the State; a contest momentous in its consequence for the entire West.

Boniface V., 619-625.

Deusdedit died on November 8, 618, apparently of the plague. Before his successor, the Neapolitan Boniface, had been ordained, a second revolution broke out in Ravenna, headed by the Exarch Eleutherius himself. This ambitious eunuch, tempted by the difficulties in which the Byzantine Emperor was involved, by the war against the Persians and Avars, to seek independence, set up as Emperor in Italy, and advanced against Rome, hoping to overpower the city and to obtain ratification for his high-handed act. He was, however, killed by his own troops at Castel Luceoli, and his head sent to Constantinople in 619.[1] The ordination of the newly-elected Pope took place in December of the same year,[2] but, although he is believed to have lived until October 625, nothing is recorded of the reign of Boniface V. beyond the term of its duration.

[1] *Lib. Pont.*, Bonifacius V., and Paul. Diacon., iv. c. 34.

[2] Pagi, *Critica* in Baron., and Franz Pagi, *Breviar.*, on this year.

The seventh century, the most fatal and destructive in the history of the city, is veiled in darkness during the first fifty years of its course. While Heraclius, by his brilliant campaigns in the East, shook the Persian kingdom under Chosroes, and prepared the way for the future conquest of the country by the Arabs, while the religion of Mohammed was founded and spread amidst furious struggles in Arabia, Rome lay like the consumed dross of history on the ground. We know nothing of the inner conditions of the city; no Dux, no Magister Militum, no Prefect is anywhere mentioned, and we search in vain for any trace of municipal life or civic organisation.

Honorius I., 625–638.

Honorius I. of Campania, son of Petronius, a man of noble Latin race, who had borne the consular title, ascended the chair of Peter only a few days after the death of Boniface V., a circumstance which causes ecclesiastical annalists to suppose that the Exarch Isaac must have been in Rome to ratify the appointment.[1] While they assume that the right of confirming the papal elections had hitherto been usually made over to the Exarchs by the Emperors, they not unreasonably appeal to the formulae of the *Liber Diurnus*, the diary of the Roman bishops, compiled between the years 685 and 752. Although the *Liber Diurnus* contains the formulae petitioning the Emperor to ratify the election, these formulae remain in the background, while those to the Exarch are couched in the most urgent and obsequious terms. The Archpresbyter, Arch-

[1] See the two Pagi. According to Jaffé, *Reg. Pont.*, Boniface V. was buried on Oct. 25, and Honorius I. consecrated on Nov. 3.

deacon, and Primicerius of the Notaries were accustomed to notify the death of the Pope to the Exarch; the deed of the election, signed by the clergy and laity, was then deposited among the archives of the Lateran, and a copy sent to the Emperor. More important was the intelligence furnished to the Exarch, the viceroy of Italy being not only implored in submissive accents to ratify the election, but the Archbishop and Judices of Ravenna also entreated to use their influence in obtaining the sanction of the all-powerful regent. These formulae prove beyond doubt the absolute power of the viceroy; we may therefore assume that the Exarch, at this time as representative of the Emperor, confirmed the already elected Popes, but it remains questionable whether later, especially from the time of Honorius onwards, he invariably retained this right. The Roman clergy and people must naturally have attached more importance to the favour of the Exarch than to that of the Emperor, since the former stood in immediate relation towards their city, and guided the decisions of the Byzantine court. It is probable therefore that, suffering under the delay in the ordination of their bishops, the people themselves implored the Emperor to spare them this annoyance by delegating the privilege of confirmation to the Exarch.[1]

The Romans had reason to be satisfied with the

[1] Garnerius, editor of the *Liber Diurnus*, believes that the second Formula or *Decretum de electione Pontificis* was issued after the election of Bonif. V. It is witnessed by *Clerus, Optimates et Milites seu Cives;* a fact, which, were it possible to ascertain the precise date of the decree, would be of importance for the history of the constitution of the city.

election of a compatriot of distinguished family, and Honorius, a pious and highly-educated man, strove to follow in the steps of the great Gregory. But the scope of our history allows us to describe neither his exertions for the restoration of King Adelwald, dethroned by Ariald in 625, his solicitude for the conversion of the East and West Saxons in Britain, nor his indulgence, so severely censured by the Catholics, towards the heresy of the Monothelites. He distinguished himself in Rome by the building of churches, securing for his memory a place by the side of Damasus and Symmachus. After a long interval of time a Pope thus again appears who furthers the transformation of the ancient city. Peace with the Lombards gave him a free hand; the wars of former days had not exhausted the already wealthy treasury of the church; and, when the question was one of decorating the basilicas of the city, the son of the Consul Petronius did not spare the revenues of the patrimonies.

Decorates S. Peter's.

He restored all the church furniture in the Basilica of S. Peter with the utmost magnificence, covering the shrine with massive silver to the amount of 187 pounds weight. The present splendour of the tomb of the Apostle is but modest adornment compared with the wealth lavished on it in this and the following centuries. Honorius covered the middle door of entrance with plates of silver 975 pounds in weight. This door was called the *Janua regia major* or *mediana*, and from henceforward also, on account of its adornment, *argentea*.[1] An ancient inscription

[1] *Investivit regias majores in ingressu ecclesiae, quam vocunt medianam, ex argento*, &c. *Lib. Pont.*

in verse, stating that Honorius had put an end to the Istrian schism, was fastened to it, whence it follows that the work would not have been executed until after the year 630. The inscription simply speaks of the Pope as Duke of the people, *Dux Plebis*.[1] The silver covering of the door may probably have been adorned with chased workmanship, since we can hardly suppose it to have been a plating of simple metal. Besides this, the main door, there were in the ancient church four other doors, which had perhaps already received the names by which they were known in the Middle Ages. The second on the right, called Romana, was set apart for the Roman people; the third, Guidonea, served the pilgrims; the fourth, at the left of the principal door, was known as Ravignana or Ravennata, because reserved for the inhabitants of Trastevere (called in the Middle Ages the town of the Ravennese); the fifth was termed *Janua judicii*, from the fact that through it the dead were carried into the church.[2]

Honorius also placed two great candelabra, each

[1] Gruter, 1163-5, according to the Cod. Palatin. I give the end :—

*Sed bonus Antistes dux plebis Honorius armis*
*Reddidit ecclesiis membra revulsa piis.*
*Doctrinis monitisque suis de faucibus hostis*
*Austulit exactis jam peritura modis.*
*At tuus argento praesul construxit opimo*
*Ornavitque fores Petre beate tibi.*
*Tu modo coelorum quapropter Janitor alme*
*Fac tranquilla tui tempora cuncta gregis.*

[2] Severan., &c., i. 68. Guidonea—*per quella erano guidati—i Peregrini.* If we can accept this questionable explanation, the name certainly cannot belong to the seventh century.

weighing 272 pounds, before the grave of the Apostle, but even the splendour of these ornaments paled before the magnificence of the new roof. The cupidity of the priests had long been directed to the gilt bronze tiles, spared by the Vandals, of Hadrian's finest building, the Temple of Rome and Venus. Honorius succeeded in obtaining this ancient roof as a gift from the Emperor Heraclius, and the greatest temple of ancient Rome was thus consigned to destruction. Its tiles were removed to cover the roof of S. Peter's,[1] and scarcely a Roman but rejoiced in the removal, scarcely one bewailed the ruin of one of the finest monuments of antiquity.

Chapel of S. Apollinaris.

Honorius also decorated the shrine of S. Andrew, erected by Symmachus in S. Peter's, and built another chapel to S. Apollinaris in the Porticus Palmaria of the basilica; or so at least we are informed by the *Liber Pontificalis*. The little church of S. Apollinaris, although not within the portico, stood close beside it. Apollinaris, a Greek saint from Antioch, was to the city of Ravenna what the Apostle Peter was to Rome, namely, the legendary founder of her bishopric; and Honorius, in admitting the Greek saint to the Roman calendar, probably wished to do honour to the powerful Exarch and the Archbishop. The Pope, nevertheless, was not unmindful of the fact that, according to tradition, Apollinaris had been consecrated to the See of the capital of the Exarchate by S. Peter himself.

[1] *Operuit etiam omnem ecclesiam ejus ex tegulis aereis, quas levavit de templo, quod appellatur Romae* (erroneously *Romuli*) *ex concessu Heraclii piissimi Imperatoris. Lib. Pont.* in Honorio.

Other basilicas, which still endure as memorials of the reign of Honorius, owe their existence to the Pope's passion for building. Among these the most remarkable is S. Adriano, constructed for the reception of the remains of the Nicomedian martyr, brought from Constantinople. One of the most noteworthy sites of ancient Rome, a spot which hitherto, under the name of Tria Fata, had possessed a civic importance, was especially chosen by Honorius for the basilica. Here stood the time-honoured Curia, or Senatorial Palace of Imperial times, and beside it other famous monuments,—the Comitium, the Arch of Janus, and the Basilica of Aemilius Paulus.

A fire had destroyed the Curia in the time of Carinus: the palace, however, had been rebuilt by Diocletian, and to it belonged the *Secretarium Senatus*, restored in 412 by Epiphanius, the City Prefect. In the year 630 all these buildings still remained erect—an imposing group—and every Roman was familiar with their former significance. The ancient Hall of Council was known in the mouths of the people as the Curia or Senatus. Here, round the Altar of Victory, had been fought the latest struggle between Paganism and Christianity; here, in the time of Theodoric and the Gothic kings, the remnant of the most revered institution of the Empire had assembled in parliament. The halls and chambers had, however, remained empty and forsaken for more than fifty years, and successive sacks had robbed them of their costly decorations. Honorius, following the example of Felix IV., who a century

earlier had transformed the circular Temple of Romulus and the Temple of the City into a church, resolved to construct a basilica within one of the desolate halls, and Adrian, a martyr bearing the name of a renowned Emperor, now entered the ancient Curia. Such was the fate of the world-famous Palace of the Roman Senate; the only fragment of its remains survives in the church of a saint; for the most recent enquiries, confirming, as they do, the theory that the basilica S. Adriano was erected in one of the halls of the Curia, cannot be impugned.[1]

Within the neighbouring church of S. Martina, which had probably been erected in the seventh century, and which occupies the site of the *Secretarium Senatus*, was discovered the inscription announcing its restoration by Epiphanius, Prefect of the City.[2]

Churches gradually arose throughout the entire spacious district, which extends from the foot of the Capitol across the Forum and along the Via Sacra, as far as the Palatine. Opposite S. Adriano an oratory within the Mamertine prison had been consecrated to S. Peter, perhaps as early as the sixth century; and the church of S. Lorenzo in Miranda was erected within the Temple of Antoninus and Faustina at some date unknown. The remains of the Templum Sacrae Urbis had been transformed

[1] The *Lib. Pont.*, "Vita Honorii," unfortunately merely indicates the site thus: *fecit basilicam b. Adriano in tribus fatis.* Early archaeologists, such as Marlianus and Marangoni, believed S. Adriano to have been the Temple of Saturn, in which was the Aerarium. See the recent investigations in Lanciani, *L'Aula e gli uffici del Senato Romano* (Lincei, 1882–1883).

[2] *Corp. I. L.*, vi. 1718.

into the oft-named Basilica of SS. Cosma and Damiano, and the church of S. Maria de Inferno had arisen close to the Temple of Vesta and the dwelling of the Vestal Virgins.[1] A Christian oratory, moreover, seems to have been constructed within the very Basilica of Julius Caesar itself.[2]

Many monuments of antiquity adjoining the Roman Forum were thus, by a somewhat violent transformation, preserved to ecclesiastical uses, and contributed to invest this, the now ruinous centre of national life of by-gone days, with at least as much importance as a religious atmosphere could lend it. The Forum had served under the later Emperors and during Gothic times as a place for political meetings, and, even after its desertion in the seventh century, it remained one of the chief centres of the city. Roman life had not yet withdrawn itself from the Forum and its neighbouring hills to the low-lying Campus Martius. At the time of the pestilence, during the reign of Gregory the Great, the most important of the processions, that of the presbyters, issued from the Forum, and again in 767 it formed the place of meeting of the populace on the occasion of a much-contested papal election. The time was

[1] Legend has ascribed the foundation of this church to Pope Sylvester. It was also known as the church *S. Silvestri in Lacu* (*Curtii*). Panciroli, *tesori nascosti*, p. 702; Martinelli, *Roma ex ethn. sacra*, p. 222. Remains of the earliest walls of the church, decorated with paintings, were discovered in 1885.

[2] In the list of Roman churches taken from the Turin Catalogue in Papencordt (*Gesch. d. Stadt Rom.*, p. 53) we find *Ecc. S. Marie in Foro*, followed by *S. Adriani* and *S. Martine*. Marucchi, p. 130 would identify the traces of a Christian oratory in the *Basilica Julii* with this church. This, however, is mere conjecture.

yet distant when the Forum Romanum sank to the level of a public stone quarry and rubbish heap, and in the days of Pope Honorius, although falling day by day into ever deeper ruin, it may be said on the whole to have still retained its ancient character.[1]

### 3. S. Theodore by the Palatine—Ancient Associations—The Church SS. *Quatuor Coronatorum* on the Coelian—S. Lucia *in Selce*—S. Agnese outside the Porta Nomentana—S. Vincenzo and Anastasio *ad Aquas Salvias*—S. Pancrazio.

Two ancient churches stood in the neighbourhood of the Forum and at the foot of the Palatine,—S. Anastasia and S. Theodore,—both of which may here find mention in connection with the other basilicas with which we have already dealt. The date of their erection is uncertain. The first is spoken of as a titular church in the Council of Symmachus (499); the other appears as a diaconate during the reign of Gregory the Great.

Church of S. Teodoro.

Theodore, a brave soldier, like George and Sebastian, had suffered martyrdom in the persecution of the Christians under Maximian, dying at Amasea in Pontus on the pyre, for having in his zeal set fire to the Temple of Cybele. The Romans dedicated a

[1] To write the history of the gradual ruin of the Roman Forum would be an attractive but most difficult task. The reader, however, will find information on the subject scattered through succeeding volumes. It is generally believed that the Forum did not cease to be a place of popular resort until after the sack of the city by Robert Guiscard in the twelfth century (O. Marucchi, *Descriz. del. Foro Rom.*, 1883, p. 8). This supposition is, however, incapable of proof.

circular church to his memory on the slope of the Palatine, a district of greater legendary renown than almost any in Rome. Here in earlier days stood the Ruminalian fig-tree and the ancient Lupercal; and here some pious bishop later erected a church, in order to banish the memories which obstinately lingered around the Lupercalia, Mars and Romulus, by the memory of a Christian warrior. Whether Felix IV. built the church or not, is uncertain, nor can it be ascertained to what date the mosaics in the tribune belong. The grouping of the figures resembles that in SS. Cosma and Damiano; Christ sits on the star-studded globe, His right hand raised in the act of blessing, His left holding the staff with the cross. To the right stands S. Paul with a book; to the left S. Peter with the key; near the latter, S. Theodore in a gold-embroidered vestment, bearing the crown of martyrdom; near S. Paul another figure likewise bearing a crown. The beautiful youthful figure of Theodore must have been the subject of later restoration, due perhaps to the time of Nicholas V., who had the circular church restored, but did not allow the ancient tribune to be demolished.

Roman antiquaries have erroneously supposed that the bronze group of the she-wolf was discovered near S. Theodore's. On the score of a group answering to the description having stood in ancient times in a little temple in the Palatine, the church of S. Theodore was long held to have been the Temple of Romulus.[1] The bronze wolf, however, stood in the

[1] Marangoni, *Cose Gent.*, c. 52, cites S. Teodoro as the third in the series of Pagan temples transformed to the uses of Christianity.

Lateran as early as the tenth century, and was thence transferred to the Capitol in 1471.[1] Pagan tradition centring round S. Theodore survived through a long course of centuries, and as in ancient Rome mothers had carried their ailing infants to the Temple of the Twin Brethren Romulus and Remus, Christian women brought their suffering children to the saint.[2] Even in the later Middle Ages Roman nurses celebrated their festival on S. Theodore's day, on the spot known to tradition as the site of the fabulous grave of the nurse of Romulus and Remus.

SS. Quattro Coronati.

Honorius also restored the celebrated basilica on the Coelian, that of the Quattro Coronati, *Sanctorum Quatuor Coronatorum*, which had existed as a titular church under Gregory the Great.[3] It had been

Panciroli believes it to have been the Temple of Romulus and Remus. Venuti, Marlianus, Winckelmann, and Nibby (note to Nardini, ii. lib. v. c. 4, 162) explain it as a Temple of Romulus. The history of the church has been written by Torrigius, 1643.

[1] See E. Stevenson's investigation regarding the bronze wolf in the Capitol, in the "Scoperte di antichi edifizi al Laterano," *Annal. dell' Ist. a.*, 1877, p. 376, ff. Winckelmann, *Gesch. d. Kunst d. Alt.*, iii. 3, § 11, is of opinion that the group of the suckling wolf is the ancient one mentioned by Dionysius (*Ant. Rom.*, i. c. 79, p. 65). Dionysius, however, speaks of a τέμενος where he had seen the group standing in the neighbourhood of the Lupercal : χάλκεα ποιήματα παλαιᾶς ἐργασίας. There was a second group of the same description in the Capitol.

[2] Venuti, *Descriz. delle antichità di Roma*, P. 1, c. 1. Panciroli, *tesori nascosti*, p. 705. Torrigius (cap. 21) gives the ancient prayers for the sick, which end with the words : *per signum sanctiferae Crucis, et intercessionem Beati Theodori liberet te Dominus noster Jesus Christus ab hac infirmitate.* At present S. Teodoro belongs to the *Sodalitas Sacrati Cordis Jesu.* An ancient ara serves as cantharus in the courtyard.

[3] De Rossi, "I Santi Q. Coronati e la loro chiesa sul Celio," *Bull. di Arch. Crist.*, 1879, p. 45, f.

erected on the ruins of an ancient building in the quarter Caput Africae. Beautiful Corinthian columns in the vestibule, and the fragment of an architrave built into the wall still prove that some ancient building had been despoiled to provide materials for its construction. The four "Coronati," martyrs of the time of Diocletian, were four Roman Cornicularii, or officers of the lower rank, and bore the names of Severus, Severinus, Carpoforus, and Victorinus.[1] The Coelian, as having probably been the site of the Castra Peregrina in ancient times, had been purposely chosen for these canonised members of the Roman army. The building of Honorius has, unfortunately, disappeared in successive restorations. The mediaeval walls of the beautiful church now tower like a fortress beside the ruins of the Aqua Claudia and the massive circular church of S. Stephen, and impart a striking character to the Coelian Hill.

S. Lucia in Silice.

S. Lucia on the Carinae, called in Silice, from a street paved with polygonal blocks of basalt, also dates from the time of Honorius. This church was also called *in Orphea*, perhaps from the ancient fountain (*Lacus Orphei*) mentioned by Martial as situated in the neighbourhood.[2] It seems to have been entirely restored by Honorius. Outside the city

[1] *Martyrol. Roman.* for the 8th November. Five stone-masons from Pannonia, who refused to chisel images of the gods, were honoured in the same church. The legend concerning them has been edited by Wattenbach in M. Büdinger's *Untersuchungen zur Röm. Kaisergesch.*, iii. *ad fin.*

[2] *Illic Orphea protinus videbis*
*Udi vertice lubricum theatri, &c.*
—*Martial*, x. 19.

the Pope was no less active, building a church to S. Cyriacus at the seventh milestone on the road to Ostia, and one to Severinus near Tivoli, and rebuilding from its foundations the celebrated Basilica of S. Agnese beyond the Porta Nomentana.

Basilica of S. Agnese.

Agnes, according to legend, a Roman girl of patrician family, suffered martyrdom when only thirteen years of age. The son of Symphronius, the City Prefect, hopelessly loved the child and fell victim to a fatal melancholy; his father entreated the maiden to save his despairing son, when she confessed that she had become a Christian. On her refusal to sacrifice to Vesta, the Prefect caused her to be removed to the vaults of the Circus Agonalis, where, as in all the Roman places of entertainment, courtesans used to ply their trade. Angels unseen, however, veiled the tender maiden with her long hair; celestial lights repelled her lover's importunate attendants; the son of the Prefect himself sank lifeless on the threshold of her chamber. Restored to consciousness by the virgin at his father's entreaties, he hurried through the streets, fervently invoking the God of the Christians. The priests of the old religion sentenced Agnes to be burnt as a sorceress, but as the flames of the pyre shrank from her, she fell a victim to the sword of the executioner. Legend adds that her death took place on January 21, 303.[1]

The youthful saint was buried on the family estate outside the Nomentan Gate, and her marble sarcophagus, with its representations of Oceanus and

[1] *Martyrol. Rom.* and Usuardi on January 21. Surius, i. 488, ascribes the legend to S. Ambrose, and Jacobus de Voragine.

Gaea, Eros and Psyche, is still preserved. Her fame spread so rapidly that a church was built, and catacombs of considerable extent were soon founded in her honour. The erection of the original catacomb church, afterwards restored by Symmachus, is attributed, by an ancient inscription, to Constantina, a Roman lady.[1] Scarcely a hundred years later, the building was found by Honorius to be in such ruinous condition that he restored it; and although, in the course of time, it has suffered many alterations, it still remains essentially a work of this Pope, and the finest memorial of his reign. Like the ancient sepulchral church of S. Lorenzo, S. Agnese is also situated in a hollow, namely, on the edge of a valley which runs from the Via Nomentana towards the Salara, and so far below the level of the ground that a descent of forty-seven steps leads to the entrance. The basilica, though small, is of graceful proportions, and does honour to the architecture of the period. It possesses two rows of columns with Roman arches, one over the other, the higher forming an upper church. The beautiful workmanship and the Phrygian marble prove that these columns were taken from some ancient monument. The great

[1] *Constantina Deum venerans Christoque dicata,*
*Omnibus impensis devota menta paratis,*
*Numine divino multum Christoque juvante,*
*Sacravit templum victricis virginis Agnes, &c.*
—*Röm. Stadtbeschr.*, iii. 2, 445.

The inscription is attributed to Damasus, who composed several epitaphs in honour of the martyrs, especially that on S. Agnes, still to be read on a marble tablet in the basilica. Prudentius dedicated a poem to the saint.

tabernacle of gilt bronze, erected by Honorius over the shrine, has disappeared, but the mosaics on their gold background in the tribune remain, a memorial of his time and of the decline of mosaic art which had already set in. They consist of only three figures, which, although devoid of individuality and life, are pleasing by reason of their simplicity. In the middle stands Agnes crowned with the nimbus, an attenuated figure of Byzantine character, her face guiltless of light and shade, her limbs draped in richly embroidered oriental robes. The hand of God the Father stretches forth to place the wreath upon her head; at her feet lies the sword of the executioner; flames break forth at each side. On the right Honorius presents her with a model of the basilica; on the left stands another bishop, Symmachus or Sylvester; both wear a chestnut-brown chasuble and white pallium, their shaven heads are uncrowned by any halo. Below the mosaic the ancient verses, among the best of their period and more artistic than the picture which they extol, are still legible.[1]

Aurea concisis surgit pictura metallis,
Et complexa simul clauditur ipsa dies.
Fontibus e niveis credas aurora subire
Correptas nubes roribus arva rigans.
Vel qualem inter sidera lucem proferet Iris
Purpureusque pavo ipse colore nitens,

[1] Pius IX. and a company assembled in the Coenobium of S. Agnese, on the 14th April 1855, were suddenly precipitated to the lower storey, owing to the floor of the hall having given way. The Pope restored the church in gratitude for his escape, but the tastelessness and glaring effect of the modern paintings have utterly destroyed the simple character of the ancient basilica.

Qui potuit noctis, vel lucis reddere finem,
Martyrum e bustis huic reppulit ille chaos.
Sursum versa nutu, quod cunctis cernitur uno
Praesul Honorius haec vota dicata dedit,
Vestibus et factis signantur illius ora,
Lucet et aspectu lucida corda gerens.

—*Gruter*, 1172–4.

Basilica *ad Aquas Salvias.*

Tradition has also attributed to Honorius the foundation of the church of S. Vincenzo and Anastasio *ad Aquas Salvias* on the Via Ardeatina beyond the Porta San Paolo. Of the three lonely churches which gradually arose in this neighbourhood, that dedicated to these two saints was the most important. No other church in Rome bears the like stamp of antiquity; nevertheless, the present building is later than the first foundation of Honorius, if indeed the Pope built it at all. The Deacon Vincent, a renowned Spanish saint, like his compatriot Lawrence, had suffered martyrdom on a gridiron at Saragossa in the time of Diocletian, and through the merits of her two saints Spain had attained a place of honour in the Roman worship. On the other hand, Anastasius, a Persian magus in the army of King Chosroes, deserted his colours, and, becoming a Christian in Jerusalem, returned to Persia as a missionary of his new faith.[1] Tradition adds that the victorious Heraclius sent the head of the martyr to Rome. The altar here dedicated

[1] *Martyrol. Roman.* for the 22nd January. Prudentius sang the fame of S. Vincent in *Peristeph.*, Hymn. 5. On the churches *ad Aquas Salvias*, see J. Giorgi in the *Archivio della Società Romana*, i. 1878, p. 49, ff. The Basilica of Anastasius is not mentioned until the end of the eighth century. The church over the three fountains, dedicated to S. Paul, existed long previous to the year 688. De Rossi, *Bull.*, 1869, p. 88.

to Anastasius was therefore a memorial of the Persian campaign of this great Emperor. In these days monarchs, to whom the Roman bishops stood largely indebted, obtained altars for such saints as they chose to put forward as candidates for the honour, even as in later times they received the cardinal's purple for their favourites. The wars of Heraclius were the crusades of the seventh century ; and the victorious Emperor forced the Persians to surrender the Cross of Christ, held to be true and genuine, which Chosroes had taken from Jerusalem, the Emperor himself bringing it in solemn procession back to the sacred city.

Church of S. Pancrazio.

Honorius, in his love for building, also restored the Basilica of S. Pancratius. Pancratius had been a contemporary of Agnes, and, likewise, a youthful martyr of fourteen. He had accompanied his uncle Dionysius from Phrygia to Rome, had been baptised on the Coelian Hill, and soon afterwards beheaded, as a follower of Christianity, on the Aurelian Way. The pious Octavilla caused his body to be interred in the pozzolana caves, and soon afterwards the canonised youth was honoured as one of the foremost heroes of Christian Rome. Even before Symmachus, about the year 500, had erected a church in the catacombs to his memory, innumerable pilgrims had thronged to visit his grave, and his name had been given to the ancient gate previously known as the Aurelian or Janiculan. Procopius, in his history of the Gothic war, had already spoken of this gate as the *Porta Sancti Pancratii*. The Romans were accustomed to pledge their most solemn oaths by the grave of the saint, under the belief that the curse of heaven would descend on

the perjurer.[1] The procession of Pelagius I. already described, when, accompanied by Narses, the Pope walked from S. Pancrazio to S. Peter's to free himself from the accusation of complicity in the death of Vigilius, was most undoubtedly connected with this belief. Pelagius had evidently first taken his stand by the grave of the Defender of the Oath.

Gregory had built a convent close to this church of Symmachus about 594. Honorius found the ancient basilica in ruins, and restored it in 638. An inscription under the mosaic set forth the particulars of its erection. The mosaic, however, was destroyed, and in the later transformation of the church but few traces of the earlier building can be discovered.

In speaking of this church a distorted passage in the *Liber Pontificalis* mentions that Honorius had erected mills near the city walls, close to the aqueduct of Trajan, which bore the water from the Sabatine lake to the city. As it is impossible that mills could have been erected on the Janiculum unless the aqueduct of Trajan, which entered by the Pancratian Gate, was at the time capable of providing the necessary supply of water, this passage may serve to confirm the supposition that Belisarius had actually restored the aqueduct of Trajan.[2]

[1] *Est haud procul ab hujus urbis muro et S. Pancratius Martyr, valde in perjuriis ultor.* Gregory of Tours, *de Gloria Martyrum*, c. 35; Paulinus, *de Basilica S. Pancratii disquisitio*, Romae, 1803; M. Armellini, *Le Chiese di Roma*, 1887, p. 766.

[2] *Et ibi constituit molam in loco Trajani juxta murum civitatis, et formam, quae ducit aquam a loco Sabbatino, et sub se formam, quae conducit aquam ad Tiberim.* See *Lib. Pont.* at the close of the "Vita Honorii."

# CHAPTER V.

1. Death of Honorius I., 638—The Chartular Maurice and the Exarch Isaac Sack the Ecclesiastical Treasury—Severinus—John IV. —The Lateran Baptistery—Theodorus, 642—Rebellion of Maurice in Rome—Death of the Exarch Isaac—Court Revolution in Byzantium—Constans II. Emperor—The Patriarch Pyrrhus in Rome—The Churches of S. Valentine and S. Euplus.

Severinus Pope, 640.

HONORIUS I. died on October 12, 638, and was buried in S. Peter's, when the Romans chose their fellow-citizen Severinus, the son of Labienus, as his successor. The election was not, however, ratified for more than a year, apparently on account of the refusal of the Pope-elect to sign the Ecthesis of the Patriarch Sergius, a formula favourable to Monothelism.[1]

The Exarch robs the ecclesiastical treasury.

Meanwhile, before the ordination had taken place, the Imperial officials had laid violent hands on the ecclesiastical treasury. The Vestiarium of the episcopal palace contained not only the numerous

[1] According to Jaffé, *Reg. Pont.*, Severinus was consecrated on May 28, 640, and was buried on the 2nd August of the same year, after a pontificate of two months and four days.

offerings with which Emperors, consuls, and private persons had endowed it, but also the money out of which, among other current expenses, the ransoms of prisoners of war and the alms to the poor were defrayed. It was reported that Honorius had accumulated wealth incalculable, and the magnificence of his buildings lends strength to the statement. The Exarch found himself in grievous straits; the Imperial troops demanded their pay, and Isaac conceived the thought of seizing the treasury of the Church. The Chartular Maurice was now in Rome, perhaps in the capacity of Magister Militum and commanding officer of the Roman army. This Exercitus Romanus consisted of troops in the pay of Byzantium, but which had undoubtedly, in the first instance, been organised as a city militia. Maurice, with the knowledge and sanction of some of the more prominent citizens, summoned these mercenaries together. He told them it was unjust that Honorius should keep such vast wealth locked up in the Patriarchate, from which they themselves had received no pay, and where even the wages sent from time to time by the Emperor were withheld. The populace immediately rose throughout the entire city, and, thirsting for spoil, attacked the Lateran. A scene is revealed to sight, such as was usually repeated throughout the Middle Ages on the death of a Pope. The retainers of the Palace made a manful resistance, and Maurice shrank from bloodshed. For three days he held the Lateran besieged; then, summoning the Judices, that is to say, all the chief officials and magnates of the city, he took

counsel with them; in accordance with their decision he placed the Imperial seal on the treasury, and then invited the Exarch to come in person and take possession of the wealth he coveted. Isaac did not hesitate; he came, forcibly drove the presbyters or cardinals out of the city, and, during his eight days' sojourn, completely sacked the Lateran. A part of the spoil he gave to the troops, another share he kept for himself, a third he sent to Heraclius, who, it would appear, left the sacrilege unpunished.

The Exarch had come to Rome under the pretext of ratifying the election of Severinus, on whose sanction of the spoliation Isaac had probably made the ratification dependent; for the candidate was consecrated forthwith, and Isaac returned to Ravenna.[1] Severinus ascended the papal throne, which he only filled for the short space of two months and six days, on May 28, 640.

John IV., 640–642.

The reign of his successor, John IV., a Dalmatian and son of the Scholasticus Venantius, was likewise brief; for he survived his ordination (December 25, 640) only a year and nine months. An oratory close to the Lateran Baptistery, which claims our present attention, survives as a memorial of his reign.

The Lateran Baptistery.

The Baptistery, *S. Johannis in Fonte*, beside the Lateran, was originally the only chapel in Rome in which bishops administered the rite of baptism on Easter Eve. It had served as the model for all those ancient baptisteries in Italy as are separate from the churches. The Baptistery of the Lateran, according to tradition, had originally been built as

[1] This is evident from the *Lib. Pont.*, in Severino.

a hall belonging to the palace, where Constantine had received baptism at the hands of Sylvester.[1] So much is at least certain, that Sixtus III. erected here the eight magnificent porphyry columns, and the present octagonal building, which was afterwards only raised in height, probably also owes its origin to the same Pope.[2] In later days Hilary constructed the still existing oratories of SS. John the Baptist and Evangelist. A fragment of the ancient mosaic on the roof of the latter oratory, representing vases, fruits, birds and ornaments in the style of Pagan art, which is here seen for the last time, is also still preserved, with the original bronze doors of the oratory of the Baptist.[3] Hilary, moreover, consecrated a third oratory to the worship of the Cross, and built the chapel of S. Stephen opposite.[4]

Such was the form of the Lateran Baptistery at the time when John IV. added the fourth oratory,

[1] *Lib. Pont.*, "Vita S. Silvestri." That Constantine did not receive baptism at the hands of Sylvester, but at those of some Arian Bishop just before his death, will be known to the reader.

[2] *Lib. Pont.* in Sixto III.: *hic fecit in Basilica Constant. ornamentum super fontem, quod ante ibi non erat, i.e., epistylia marmorea, et columnas porphyreticas erexit—quas et versibus exornavit.* These couplets may still be read in modern characters on the architrave above the columns.

[3] The ancient inscription: *In honor. B. Jo. Baptistae Hilarus Ep. Dei famulus offert.* In the other oratory the restored inscription over the door: *Liberatori Suo B. Joanni Evangelistae Hilarus Ep. fam. Christi.* It was founded by Hilary in gratitude for his escape from death at the robber-synod of Ephesus (449), which he had attended as legate. That the same Pope must also have added to the Baptistery is evident from Gruter, 1163, n. 11.

[4] *Lib. Pont.* in Hilaro, n. 69. They have been destroyed; the oratory of the cross survived until the time of Sixtus the Fifth.

dedicated to S. Venantius. The saint, whose name was also borne by the father of the Pope, had been a Dalmatian bishop, and the Istrian schism having at this time been appeased, the Pope, in doing honour to the national saint of the province, may have hoped the more closely to unite it to Rome. With Venantius and Bishop Domnius, eight canonised Slavonian warriors also obtained admission to the city and oratory. The still existing mosaics of the time of John IV., in the coarseness of their style, betray the depth to which painting had fallen. In the fifth and sixth centuries the last remains of the sense of beauty, common to the ancients, had vanished from Christian art. In the seventh the perception of form and the knowledge of drawing likewise perished, and a glance at the mosaics of this and the following period suffices to reveal the barbarism which prevailed in Rome and throughout the West. In this oratory the apocalyptic representations of the four Evangelists are enclosed in square frames over the triumphal arch; at each side stand four saints; in the tribune is a rough half-length portrait of Christ, between two angels and surrounded by clouds, His right hand raised. Below is a series of nine figures, the Virgin in dark blue draperies in the middle, her arms uplifted in prayer, after the manner of the paintings in the catacombs. Peter and Paul stand one at each side, the latter holding not the sword, but a book; Peter not only the two keys, but also the pilgrim-staff with the cross, like the aged Baptist beside him. The Bishops Venantius and Domnius follow; on the left the builder of the oratory, bearing

the model of the church ; on the right another figure, probably Pope Theodore, who finished the building. Three couplets are written in one line underneath.[1]

Rome, meanwhile, enjoyed a prolonged respite from Lombard aggression. The war between the Exarch and King Rotharis affected only the northern provinces ; and even the great battle on the Scultenna, which cost the lives of eight thousand Greeks, produced no consequences for the city. All impending misfortune came from the side of Constantinople, where theological controversies with the Eastern Church fanned the flame of the ill-will with which the Latins regarded Greek Imperialism.

Theodorus Pope, 642–649.

The decree of the Exarch on the death of John IV. procured the election of a Greek, and Theodore, son of a Bishop of Jerusalem, was raised to the Papacy, November 24, 642. The new Pope was not, however, calculated to further the policy of Byzantium, and we may here observe that we generally find those Greeks, who in after times were elected to the papal chair, sacrificing every sentiment of nationality in favour of the principles of Rome.

The early days of Theodore's reign were disturbed by an event, the consequences of which might have been of dire importance to the city. The Chartular Maurice, of whom we have spoken as the spoiler of

[1] *Martyribus Christi Domini pia vota Johannes*
*Reddidit antistes, sanctificante Deo.*
*At sacri fontis simili fulgente metallo,*
*Providus instanter hoc copulavit opus ;*
*Quo quisquis gradiens, et Christum pronus adorans*
*Effusasque preces impetrat ille suas.*

Over the Ciampini chapel, *Veter. Mon.*, ii. c. 15.

the Church, raised the standard of rebellion in Rome, where, finding people, nobility and army alike irritated against Byzantine rule, he came to an understanding with the Romans, and induced the garrisons of all the fortresses within the territory to refuse obedience to the Exarch, and rebellion was openly declared.[1]

Maurice's rebellion.

Not only the troops, but the Judices also, joined his standard, and, although the astute clergy held aloof, the revolt assumed a national character. The outbreak, however, was soon suppressed. Donus, the Magister Militum sent by Isaac, meeting no opposition, entered the city with his troops, and Maurice clung to the altar in S. Maria Maggiore. Dragged away to be carried off with the most distinguished of his associates, he was beheaded on the way, by order of the Exarch, and his head sent to Ravenna, and set up in the Circus as a warning to others. The remainder of the prisoners were released on the news of his death.[2]

The memory of this Exarch, an Armenian by birth, is still preserved in Ravenna by the Greek inscription on the sarcophagus in S. Vitale, where he was buried by his wife Susanna. The inscription records that Isaac had successfully governed Rome

[1] *Et misit per omnia castra, quae erant sub civitate Romana per circuitum. Lib. Pont.* in Theodoro. The district belonging to the city was thus designated; no mention is yet made of the *Ducatus Romanus.*

[2] *Lib. Pont.* in Theodoro. Herm. *Contract*, and after him Baronius, give 644 as the year of the rebellion. Muratori relates the event in the same year. Marquard Freher wrongly accepts 642 as the date of Isaac's death. Montfaucon places it in 641.

and the West during eighteen years, as a fellow-soldier of the Emperors and General of the East and West.[1] He was succeeded in the Exarchate by Theodore Kalliopa.

The Pope, in the meantime, became involved in fresh disputes with the Greek Church, with which was associated a revolution in the palace at Constantinople. Heraclius Constantinus, who had ascended the throne on the death of his great father Heraclius in 641, had, four months later, been removed by poison, administered by his step-mother, Martina, and also, it is believed, by Pyrrhus, the Monothelistic patriarch. Heracleonas, the son of Martina, succeeded to the purple, but a popular insurrection condemned both mother and son to expiate their guilt by cruel mutilation and exile. Constans II., son of Heraclius Constantinus, was now proclaimed Emperor; Pyrrhus escaped to Africa, and Paul, a still more zealous supporter of the One Will, filled his place. The numerous sect of the Monothelites was a branch of the school of

Constans II. Emperor, 641.

[1] For the inscription see Montfaucon, *Diar. Ital.*, p. 98 :—

Ἐνταῦθα κεῖται ὁ στρατηγήσας καλῶς,
Ῥώμην τε φυλάξας ἀβλαβῆ καὶ τὴν δύδιν
Τρὶς ἔξ ἐνιαυτοῖς τοῖς γαληνοῖς δεσπόταις
Ἰσαάκιος τῶν βασιλέων ὁ σύμμαχος,
Ὁ τῆς ἁπάσης Ἀρμενίας κόσμος μέγας,
Ἀρμένιος ἦν γὰρ οὗτος ἐκ λαμπροῦ γένους.
Τούτου θανόντος εὐκλεῶς ἡ σύμβιος
Σώσαννα σώφρων τρυγόνος σεμνῆς τρόπῳ
Πυκνῶς στενάζει ἀνδρὸς ἐστερημένη,
Ἀνδρὸς λαχόντος ἐκ καμάτων εὐδοξίαν
Ἐν ταῖς ἀνατολαῖς ἡλιόυ καὶ τῇ δύσει,
Στρατοῦ γὰρ ἦρξε τῆς δύσεως καὶ τῆς ἕω.

the Abbot Eutyches, who had taught that the one nature (*physis*) of Christ was the result of the union of the divine and human natures. After the Monophysite doctrine had been condemned, the same question, but in an altered shape, fell under the power of Greek sophistic. Although admitting the separation of the two natures in Christ, they asserted that these were united in a single undivided energy of one will, or *monon thelema*. The Patriarch Sergius of Constantinople, Cyrus of Alexandria, Heraclius himself, had all declared themselves adherents of this doctrine, but the violent excitement which arose in consequence, in 638, caused Heraclius to issue his Ecthesis, which was rejected by Pope John IV. Christendom thus became divided into two violently contending factions, and while the East adhered to the Ecthesis, Africa and the entire West held to the orthodox teaching of Rome. Pyrrhus himself, feigning to have been converted by the eloquence of the Abbot Maximus at an African Council, not only abjured Monothelism, but came in person to Rome to lay his profession of faith at the feet of the Apostle.

The appearance of a contrite Patriarch of Constantinople at the grave of S. Peter was a no slight triumph for the Roman bishop. Although Pyrrhus had voluntarily resigned his seat, he had never been canonically deposed; and the Pope lays stress upon the fact in the letters which he addresses to those bishops who had consecrated Paul, the new patriarch. He received Pyrrhus, in the presence of the clergy and people assembled in the Vatican Basilica, with

every honour, according him an episcopal chair near the high altar. The Romans, whose national pride was now forced to rest satisfied in the consciousness of the supremacy of their Pope and Church, regarded the spectacle as a triumph. Pyrrhus evidently hoped, by means of his alliance with Rome, to recover his lost patriarchate, and feigned a belief which he did not cherish, until he recognised a better prospect of attaining his object in reconciliation with the Emperor. He accepted the invitation to the court of the Exarch, left Rome, and offended the Roman Church by a sudden recantation and return to the Monothelite creed. On receiving the news of his second change of faith, Theodore assembled a Council in S. Peter's, and condemned the renegade with curious and awful ceremonies. Advancing to the grave of the Apostle, he took the consecrated chalice, and letting a drop of the "blood of Christ" fall into the ink, signed the decree which pronounced the anathema.[1]

Pyrrhus was not perhaps wholly contemptuous of the curse of the Roman bishop, and it is probable that the recollection of the anathemas, which had been thundered against him, may have recurred at times to disturb his repose, when, on the death of Paul, he actually returned to the patriarchal chair of Byzantium. Against Paul, Theodore had likewise hurled his excommunications. And after having so staunchly defended the Roman faith, he died on May 13, 649.

[1] Theophanes, *Chronogr.*, p. 275. The fanatical custom was of Greek origin.

He left but few buildings behind in the city: the Lateran chapel begun by his predecessor may perhaps have been completed by him, and it is probable that he also built an oratory dedicated to S. Sebastian. He further built or restored two churches outside the city: S. Valentine on the cemetery on the Flaminian Way, not far from the Milvian Bridge, and S. Euplus beyond the Ostian Gate, close to the pyramid of Caius Cestius. Both fell to decay, S. Valentine being entirely destroyed, and S. Euplus apparently transformed into the church of S. Salvator *in Via Ostiensi*.[1]

### 2. Martin I. Pope, 649—Roman Synod concerning the Monothelites—Design of the Exarch Olympius against Martin's Life—Theodorus Kalliopa forcibly carries off the Pope, 653—Martin dies in Exile—Eugenius Pope, 654.

The flames of the Monothelite controversy were at their full height at the time of Theodore's death, and his successor was to fall a sacrifice to the enmity of the Byzantine patriarch.

Martin I., 649–653.

Martin I., a native of the Umbrian Tudertum (the present Todi), previously Nuncio at Constantinople, was raised to the papal chair in June or July 649. The Roman clergy ordained him before he had received the imperial ratification and a most

[1] Martinelli, *Roma ex ethnica sacra*, p. 301. The *Liber Pontif.* ascribes the foundation of S. Valentine's to Pope Julius (337–352). It was restored by Honorius and Theodore. Orazio Marucchi, *La cripta sepolcrale di S. Valentino sulla via Flaminia*, Rome, 1878.

energetic Pope now stood in opposition to the Greek Church. He summoned the bishops in council; one hundred and fifty princes of the Church, from the cities and islands of Italy, assembled on the 5th October in the Lateran[1] to discuss the Typus. This was an edict issued in 648 by Constans II., by which united Christendom was commanded to bury the question of the single or dual nature in a discreet silence. The Emperor required the Pope's assent to this edict, a subject which lay nearer the Imperial heart than the recovery of the provinces of which the Arabs had deprived him. Constans had therefore despatched Olympius, the new Exarch, to Italy, and commanded him to see that the bishops, landowners, country people, and even foreigners should sign the formula. The Exarch was even commanded to seize the Pope and to compel the bishops to accept the edict. He was further enjoined cautiously to enquire into the disposition of the Roman army, and, did he find it hostile, to let the matter rest, until he had acquired, in Rome as well as in Ravenna, a force submissive to his will.[2] A light is thus thrown upon the position in which Rome stood towards the Exarch; the Imperial official was no longer able to deal despotically with the city, and we discover for the first time, clearly and unmistakably, an army in the form of a militia, composed of the chief citizens and burghers. This army received an

[1] Labbé, *Concil.*, t. vii. p. 78, *sq.*

[2] *Si autem—potueris suadere exercitui Romae consistenti, jubemus hoc idem tenere Martinum—si autem inveneris aliquid contrarium in tali causa, exercitum tacitum habeto. . . . Lib. Pont.* in Martino. Baronius's reading, *taciti abitote*, gives a good sense.

uncertain pay from Constantinople, but was in itself essentially national and Roman, and apart from its adhesion the Exarch's scheme could scarcely have been carried out.

Failure of the Exarch's schemes.

Olympius came to Rome; he found the Lateran Council in full activity. The Ecthesis and Typus, Cyrus of Alexandria, and the three patriarchs, Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul, had already been solemnly denounced. The Exarch strove to carry out the orders of the Emperor, while, with the aid of his own troops or such of the Roman army as he could gain by bribery, he sought to work divisions in the Council.[1] The city was in a state of the greatest excitement. The Exarch remained a considerable time, and doubtless made his dwelling in the ancient Palace of the Caesars. His designs, however, failed, as did also an attempt on the life of Martin, with which he is credited at least by the *Liber Pontificalis*. Feigning to have made peace with Martin, he entered the church of S. Maria Maggiore, advanced to the altar to receive the Communion at his hands, and, while in the act of swallowing the Host, awaited the appointed sword-thrust of one of his retainers, which was to deal the death-blow of the Pope. But God, says the chronicler, accustomed to protect His servants, struck the eyes of the spathar with blindness, so that he was not able to see the Pope. We are informed at the same time that Olympius made his peace with Martin, made sincere confession, and withdrew to Sicily, where the Saracens had already

[1] *Armans se cum exercitus virtute*, or *armans secum exercitus virtutem*, according to the reading of Vignolius *in Martino*, n. v.

settled. There he suffered defeat, and was snatched away by illness in the midst of his rebellious designs.

His place in Ravenna was filled in 652 or 653 by Theodore Kalliopa, Exarch for the second time, and sent by the Emperor with express orders to overcome Martin's opposition by force.[1] Accompanied by the Chamberlain Pelarius, the Exarch entered Rome with his troops on June 15, 653. Martin, as in duty bound, sent the clergy to meet him, himself, under pretext of gout, remaining behind in the Lateran Palace. The Exarch received the envoys in the Palace of the Caesars, where he had alighted,[2] affected to lament the illness of the Pope, and declared his intention of waiting on him the following day (Sunday) to testify his respect. Suspecting that the episcopal palace would be filled with arms, he took the precaution of having it searched, and surrounded himself with his own troops, the terrified Romans making no attempt at resistance.

The Pope lay on his couch, surrounded by clergy, before the high altar of the Lateran Basilica. The Exarch entered with his armed retainers, and handed to the priests an Imperial decree, which commanded the deposition of Martin, on the charge of having usurped the sacred chair without the Emperor's ratification. The priests answered with the anathema. A tumult immediately arose; the Byzantines struck the lights from the altars with their swords, and the

[1] Muratori doubts whether Theodore Kalliopa actually filled the office of Exarch a second time. Pagi, rejecting the date (650) put forward by Baronius, believes that Martin was carried away captive in 653. Jaffé, *Reg. Pont.*

[2] *Quibus susceptis in palatio:* Ep. xv., Martini ad Theodor. in Labbé, *Concil.*, vii. p. 66.

Captivity of Martin I., 653.

defenceless Martin was torn from his couch and carried to the Palace of the Caesars. On the night of the 18th June he was conveyed thence to a boat lying in the Tiber and rowed to Portus. The clergy in a body desired to follow him into captivity, but the Exarch, allowing him only six pages or servants, had the gates closed in fear lest the Romans might attempt his release. The unfortunate Pope was first taken by a circuitous voyage to the island of Naxos, and thence in September to Constantinople, where he was imprisoned as guilty of high treason.[1] Among the accusations brought against him was that of having conspired with Olympius and brought the Saracens to Sicily.

We cannot allow ourselves to follow his bitter experiences in Constantinople, his long trial, or his manly defence, but must be satisfied here to take our leave of the heroic bishop, whose character sheds an added lustre on the Papacy. Deposed and banished by Imperial decree to the ancient Chersonesus in the Crimea, deserted alike by friends and enemies, he died on September 16, 655, a martyr for Roman supremacy.[2] His remains, first buried in the church

[1] In his letter to Theodore, Martin says that he had taken ship at Messina ; Messina, however, must here stand for Misenum. The Terra Laboris, mentioned in the same letter, is probably a corruption of Terra Liparis. Camillo Pellegrino, *de Ducatu Benevent.*, Diss. V. Misenum was at this time pronounced Messena and Mesena, Lipari probably Lebori or Labori.

[2] He reproaches his friends : *quia sic funditus infelicitatis meae obliti sunt, et nec scire volunt . . . sive sim super terram, sive non sim.* He entreats the Romans to send him means of sustenance, for, since even strangers were provided for in Rome, surely he, who had formerly been Pope, had a claim on the liberality of the people.

of the Virgin of Blachernae in Constantinople, were later brought to Rome. The *Liber Pontificalis* and the martyrologies of Bede and Ado, however, are alike silent with regard to their removal. According to Roman tradition, the coffin was deposited in the church of SS. Sylvester and Martin of Tours. The ancient titular church of Equitius was dedicated to the two Popes, Sylvester and Martin, by Sergius II. in 844, and here the festival of this Pope, whose claims to canonisation have also obtained recognition in the Greek calendar, is still celebrated on the 12th of November.

Upon the deposition and banishment of Martin, the Emperor commanded the election of a successor, and the exiled Pope was obliged to submit in silence to the uncanonical and arbitrary act. Eugenius, son of Ruffianus, a Roman belonging to the first Aventine region, was accordingly consecrated on August 10, 654, and it is now evident how completely the Romans had already become absorbed in ecclesiastical interests. The custom had arisen for the newly-elected Patriarchs to send the formulae of their faith to Rome, and the Popes theirs to Constantinople; and, in accordance with the usage, Peter, the restored Patriarch of Byzantium, hastened to despatch his Synodica, or Confession of Faith, to the Roman bishop. The document, however, was expressed in such ambiguous terms that the Romans, people as well as clergy, rejected it. Compelling Eugenius to condemn the formula, they made it evident that they resented, as a national insult, the violence to which Martin had been subjected at the hands of the heretic Greeks.

Eugenius I., 654–657.

### 3. Vitalian Pope, 657—The Emperor Constans II. visits Italy—His Reception and Sojourn in Rome, 663—A Lament over Rome—Condition of the City and its Monuments—The Colosseum—Sack under Constans—Death of the Emperor in Syracuse.

Vitalian Pope, 657–672.

Eugenius dying in June 657, Vitalian, a Latin and a native of Signia in the Volscian Mountains, was consecrated Pope on July 30. The Emperor Constans, who may have already conceived the idea of visiting the West, now sought to establish friendly relations with the Latin Church, and Vitalian, hastening to make known his forgiveness, showed himself ready to meet the Imperial advances. Constans received the Roman Nuncios, the bearers of the Synodica, with condescension, confirmed the privileges of the Roman bishopric, and sent Vitalian a gift of a codex of the Bible, set in gold and diamonds. Six years later, he came himself to Rome, but of the events which filled the interval of the city's history we are entirely ignorant.

Constans visits the West, 662.

Constans quitted the capital of the East in 662, to invest the Empire with a fresh lustre by the recovery of that portion of Southern Italy which had fallen under Lombard dominion, and by the subjugation of Rome and the Roman bishopric to Imperial rule. The shade of Theodosius (the brother whom he had murdered) drove him forth on his wanderings, and the hatred of his subjects accompanied him. Taking ship at Constantinople he came to the Piraeus. The name of the Athenian port still perhaps awoke the

reverent love of mankind, although, in the middle of the seventh century, Athens was little more than a waning recollection in the minds of the few who were acquainted with the writings of the ancient philosophers. Since the time of Justinian the voice of Philosophy had been hushed, and the melancholy remains of the most glorious period of history stood in forlorn silence around the Acropolis, as the ruins of Roman dominion round the forsaken Capitol of Jupiter. The ashes of Greece, however, unlike those of Rome, were not destined to arise to any second historic existence in after centuries.[1]

Constans sailed from Athens to Italy in the spring of 663, and the Imperial journey from Byzantium to Athens, from Athens to Tarentum, Rome, and Syracuse, was but a progress from ruins to ruins of the most celebrated cities of antiquity.

On landing at Tarentum the Emperor resolved to free the provinces of Southern Italy from the yoke of the Lombards. For so far had these conquerors Tarentum.

[1] Athens in the Middle Ages—a subject for difficult but profitable research. The *descriptio urbis Athenarum* of the *Anon. Viennensis* (τὰ θέατρα καὶ διδασκαλεῖα τῶν Ἀθηνῶν) may be read with the greatest interest. This work (the production of a Greek in the fifteenth century, published by L. Rosz from a Viennese manuscript, Vienna, 1840) shows that the veil of legend that shrouded the monuments of Rome was likewise spread over those of Athens. As in Rome, so in Athens, many imposing buildings are designated as palaces (παλάτιον), but the memory of former philosophers frequently in the Middle Ages bestowed on many ruins the name of the schools (διδασκαλεῖα) of Socrates, of the Eleatics, of the Cynics, and of the Tragedians, of Sophocles, Aristotle, &c. See my *Mirabilien der Stadt Athen, Sitzungsberichte der Kgl. bayer. Akad. d. Wissenschaften*, 1881, Bd. i. 3 Heft.

advanced, that is, if it be anything more than an idle fable that Autharis forced his way to the Straits of Messina, spurred his horse into the sea at Rhegium, and striking with his spear a column which stood there, cried, "Here is the boundary of the Lombards."[1] The Lombards, ignorant of navigation, remained an inland people, and Greek Duces, lieutenants of the Emperor, ruled in the seaports of Naples, Amalfi, Sorrentum, Gaeta, and for some time also in Tarentum; towns which remained impregnable to the Lombards. Beneventum had already been raised to a dukedom by Alboin and bestowed upon Zoto, the first duke. From this celebrated duchy, which embraced the ancient Samnium and Apulia, parts of Campania and Lucania, the predatory expeditions of the Lombards issued, and, under the fifty years' reign of his successor, Arichis II., the duchy of Benevento embraced the greater part of Southern Italy, and extended northwards beyond Sipontum as far as Mons Garganus.[2]

Beneventum.

Two years before the arrival of the Emperor in Italy, Grimoald of Benevento had seized the Lombard throne in Pavia, but had left Romuald, his youthful son, behind as Dux in the former city. Constans collected troops from Sicily, Naples, and other Greek districts, and advanced before Beneventum. He was defeated, however, by the boyish Romuald, whose

[1] Paul. Diacon., iii. c. 32.

[2] Giannone, *Storia del regno di Nap.*, iv. cap. 2, 3, and the *Dissertation* of Camillo Pellegrino; Ferd. Hirsch, *Das Herzogtum Benevent bis zum Untergange des langob. Reichs*, Leipzig, 1871, p. 9; Zigarelli, *Storia di Benevento*, Naples, 1860.

courageous defence of the city is described in one of the finest passages in the history of Paul Warnefried. On the tidings of Grimoald's approach with an army, the Emperor raised the siege, went to Naples, and leaving a force of 20,000 men at Formiae, the present Molo di Gaeta, to cover his retreat, withdrew to Rome by the Appian Way. Naples.

We may imagine the excitement which the arrival of the Imperial ruler awoke in the deserted city. The appearance of a Byzantine monarch who still legally called himself Emperor of the Romans was undoubtedly a great event. The thoughts of men turned to the last days of the Empire, passing in review the many changes that filled the two hundred intervening years: the extinction of the Western Empire, the growth and fall of the German monarchy, the overthrow of cities and nations, the ruin of ancient and the rise of new Rome. Since the days of Odoacer, no Emperor had visited the city. Here, amid ruins, the bishop or Pope, the uncontested representative of the Latin nation throughout the whole of Italy, sat alone. Constans stood, if not at open variance, at least in strained relations with the Roman Church, which had already experienced repeated insults and injuries at his hands. The Church feared him, and had he come as conqueror from Benevento, she would have been forced bitterly to rue the consequences of his victory. That he was, if not actually defeated, at least unsuccessful, was fortunate for the Church. Constans II. visits Rome, July 6, 663.

The *Liber Pontificalis* has described the ceremonial of the Emperor's reception, and the account deserves

attention, corresponding as it does to the solemnities observed throughout the entire Middle Ages on the arrival of the German Emperor. The Pope, clergy, and representatives of Rome, with crosses, banners, and tapers, awaited the Emperor at the sixth milestone from the city.[1] Vitalian was unable to confront his sovereign with the intrepid spirit displayed by Bishop Ambrose, who, when the great Theodosius arrived at Milan, stained with the blood of the rebels he had so cruelly slain, stood in the porch of the church and forbade the offender even to ascend the steps. And yet, as the hated Constans stood before the Pope, the recollection of the Imperial brother he had murdered, the starvation of Pope Martin, and the martyrdom of Maximus, the Catholic abbot, rose but too vividly to Vitalian's mind. The Emperor was conducted in solemn procession to Rome on Wednesday, July 5, 663, and we may infer that, as he came by the Via Appia, he made his entrance by the Porta Sebastiana, and that, like Theodoric, he proceeded to S. Peter's immediately on his arrival to offer his prayers and a votive gift at the grave of the Apostle. There can be no doubt that he afterwards took up his abode in the ancient Palace of the Caesars, the ruinous vastness of which must have filled the Byzantine courtiers with dismay. But, however great the ruin into which the Imperial fortress had fallen, it must still, in the seventh century, have remained to some degree habitable; for there the Dux of Rome made his dwelling. The following

[1] The *Lib. Pont.* says merely: *suscepit eum*; a sense of shame preventing the writer from adding the customary *honorifice*.

Saturday the Emperor proceeded to S. Maria Maggiore to offer a consecrated gift, and on Sunday, accompanied by his troops, went in solemn procession to S. Peter's, where, received by the clergy and the Pope, he entered the basilica. He here received the Communion at the hands of Vitalian, and laid a pallium of gold on the high altar.[1] The following Sunday he proceeded to the Lateran, bathed there, and gave a banquet in the Basilica Julii, a part of the building already known to us as a Triclinium in the ancient palace.

The pitiable position of Vitalian and his humiliation before the Emperor compel a feeling of forbearing sympathy.[2] A long course of centuries was required to elapse before this spectacle of papal submissiveness gave place to the scene of Canossa. Sunk in poverty and ruin as they were, the Romans themselves must have been roused to painful recollections by the sight of the Imperial over-lord who deigned to visit their city, and the presence of the Greek courtiers who regarded them with contempt. It seems probable that it was on this occasion that the beautiful strains of lament over the disgrace of Rome, quoted by Muratori, were raised over the fallen city.

> Nobilibus fueras quondam constructa patronis,
> Subdita nunc servis. Heu male, Roma, ruis !
> Deseruere tui tanto te tempore reges :
> Cessit et ad Graecos nomen honosque tuum.

[1] *Pallium auro textile* in Anast. ; so, too, Paul. Diacon., v. c. 11, and Bede, *de sex aetat. ad Ann.* 4625.

[2] The excuses of Baronius may be summed up in his own words : *dummodo catholicae veritati esset consultum.*

In te nobilium Rectorum nemo remansit;
Ingenuique tui rura Pelasga colunt.
Vulgus ab extremis distractum partibus orbis,
Servorum servi nunc tibi sunt domini.
Constantinopolis florens nova Roma vocatur,
Moenibus et muris Roma vetusta cadis.
Hoc cantans prisco praedixit carmine vates;
Roma, tibi subito motibus ibit amor.
Non si te Petri meritum Paulique foveret,
Tempore jam longo Roma misella fores.
Mancipibus subjecta jacens macularis iniquis,
Inclyta quae fueras nobilitate nitens.[1]

Would that power were granted us to cast a glance into the Imperial Palace on this occasion and behold the Byzantine monarch seated at the banquets given in his honour amid the crumbling ruins of the past; that we could discover the forms in which nobles and magistrates, clad in their oriental gold brocades, and the degenerate people of Rome, were

[1] Muratori discovered this elegy in a Codex at Modena (*Antiq. med. aevi*, ii. 148); reprinted by Jaffé (*Monum. Bambergensia*, p. 457) from a Bamberg Codex of the tenth century. The line: *Ingenuique tui*, &c., is explained by Troya (*Cod. Langob.*, i. 143, 144) and Pizzeti (*Antichità Toscane*, i. 322) thus: the senators, deprived of their property, had sunk to the level of coloni. The *servorum servi* refers to the Byzantines, also, perhaps ironically, to the Popes; Gregory I. having already called himself *servus servorum Dei*. The poem cannot, in my opinion, have been written before the time of Gregory. The 'versus recurrentes,' *Roma subito*, &c., is an ancient trick. Apollin. Sidon., ix. Ep. 14, speaks of it as *illud antiquum*, and adds another: *Sole medere pede, ede perede melos*. The connection between Roma and Amor is ancient and mystical. Joh. Lydus, *de Mensib.*, iv. 50, says Rome has three names:—τελεστικὸν ἱερατικὸν πολιτικόν, τελεστικὸν μὲν οἱονεὶ Ἔρως, ὥστε πάντας ἔρωτι θείῳ περὶ τὴν πόλιν κατέχεσθαι. The priestly name was Flora, the political Roma.

there represented. But the entire period is buried in impenetrable silence. We hear nothing of games, nothing of distributions of money or bread made by the Emperor, nothing of any restorations instituted by him. If, however, we are left in ignorance of the sums extorted from the ecclesiastical treasury to defray the honour of the Imperial visit, the blame is that of the silent chroniclers. Constans did not enter Rome with the reverence that had filled the son of Constantine when in 357 he visited the city, and whose admiration of the splendour of her buildings, and surprise at the number of her inhabitants, as described by Ammianus, we may perhaps recall. Constantius was more especially attracted by the Capitol, the Baths, the Amphitheatre of Titus, the Pantheon, the Temple of Venus and Rome, the columns of the Emperors, the Forum of Peace, the Theatre of Pompey, the Odeum and the Stadium of Domitian, but, above all, by the Forum of Trajan. After a period of 306, in part terrible, years, a Roman Emperor again stood in the presence of these monuments, of which, in his barbarian ignorance, he scarcely even knew the now legendary names, while the local antiquaries, if such accompanied him, could no longer explain them with the learning of a Cassiodorus. In three centuries Rome had become completely transformed. The Temple of Jupiter was already in ruins; the Baths had fallen into decay; the Fountains stood empty; grass covered the Amphitheatre, the disfigured walls of which were crumbling to fragments. The Imperial Palace, although still in part inhabited, was itself a ruin; the

Rome in the time of Constans.

Forum of Peace and all the other Forums were ruinous and deserted; the column of Trajan, like that of Marcus Aurelius, stood in majestic silence amid tottering temples and empty libraries, while here and there the blackened monument of a Greek or Roman genius struggled against oblivion. Circus and theatre were alike slowly yielding to the destructive influences of time; the huge Temple of Venus and Rome, but lately despoiled of its roof, was already half destroyed. And everywhere that the eye rested it beheld, amid the hoary monuments of antiquity, churches which had arisen from their ruins, convents clinging to their sides, or the temples themselves transformed into churches. Rome had, in every sense, experienced a metamorphosis and a transposition of her monuments; here were temples converted into basilicas; there blocks of stone, columns, and architraves, torn from the buildings to which they had belonged, and removed to form part of a more or less distant church.

The Colosseum.

A twofold city thus met the eyes of Constans; an ancient and a modern, such as exists even to the present day. And then, as now, the Amphitheatre of Titus was the centre of the ancient city. This gigantic monument of the power of the Caesars was already known in the popular dialect as the Colysaeus, not on account of the Colossus of Nero, or the *statua solis*, already long in ruin, but on account of its vast extent. The barbarous title appears for the first time at the end of the seventh century, in the writings of the English monk Bede,

who makes use of it in quoting the celebrated prophecy concerning Rome:—

> "While stands the Colysaeus, Rome shall stand,
> When falls the Colysaeus, Rome shall fall,
> And when Rome falls, the world."

Bede was never apparently in Rome, but the prophecy, together with the name Colysaeus, had probably reached the north through German pilgrims.[1] In the modern city two ecclesiastical centres had arisen: the Lateran Palace, which gradually usurped the place of the Imperial Palace, and the Vatican, the Christian Capitol. The ancient city survived in its great constructions, and even in its streets and stations; the Christian city scattered within it was apparent solely in the number and splendour of its churches, the histories of which

[1] *Quamdiu stat Colysaeus, stat et Roma: Quando cadet Colysaeus, cadet et Roma: Quando cadet Roma, cadet et Mundus.* Beda, *Collectan. et Flores*, iii. 483. Scipio Maffei is of opinion that the name is derived from the building itself (*Verona Illustr.*, iv. i. c. 4). The Amphitheatre of Capua was also known as Colossus in the ninth century, and its governor Guaifar, consequently, as Colossensis. Erchempert, *Hist. Langob.*, c. 56. Fabio Gori, *Le Memorie Storiche del Colosseo*, Rome, 1875, p. 4, also traces the derivation of the name to the structure itself. H. Jordan, *Topogr. der Stadt Rom im Altert.*, ii. 510, again revives the theory that the Amphitheatre was called after the Colossus of Nero. This was the view held by Roman antiquaries in the fifteenth century, more especially by Poggio. But is it likely that a statue, even of colossal size, and especially when that statue was destroyed, should give its name to so huge a building? The Roman Amphitheatre is called Colossus in a document of the year 972: *domum positam Romae regione quarta non longe a Colossus in templum qui vocatur Romuleum* (beside S. Cosma and Damiano); Galletti, Cod. Vat., 8054, f. 58, from S. Maria Nova; see De Rossi, *Piante icnogr. di Roma*, p. 76.

were already fast sinking into the obscurity of legend.

Constans sacks the monuments.

It is scarcely likely that the Greek Emperor indulged in melancholy reflections over the fate of the capital of the universe. More probably, as his glance roved in passing curiosity over the ruins of the city, his own possession, it may have been arrested by some objects calculated to gratify his avarice. Many statues of bronze still stood in the streets and squares as Procopius had seen them, and the wandering Byzantines probably made eager search for others in the closed temples. The Pope showed his guest the Pantheon, the gift bestowed by an Emperor on the Church, and Constans, seeing its glittering roof of gilt bronze, heedless of the glory of the Virgin or the company of Martyrs, ordered the costly tiles to be conveyed on board his vessels. Unwillingly he renounced the similar tiles belonging to the roof of S. Peter; the sanctity of the basilica, or the fear of rousing the Romans to insurrection, alone prompting his act of self-renunciation. Constans only remained twelve days in Rome, but this time sufficed to despoil the city of all but an insignificant remnant of her treasures in bronze;[1]

[1] *Omnia quae erant in aere ad ornatum civitatis, deposuit: sed et Eccl. S. Mariae ad Martyres quae tecta tegulis aereis erat, discoperuit, et in regiam urbem cum aliis diversis, quae deposuerat direxit. Lib. Pont.*, Paul. Diac., v. c. 11; *Mirabilia*; Cod. Laurent.; and *Anonym. Magliabechianus.* Fea, *Sulle Rov.*, p. 313, comforts himself with the assurance that some bronzes still remained, more especially in the Palace of the Caesars, where fragments were discovered in the eighteenth century. The bronze Hercules was unearthed in 1859, in the Palazzo Pio (the Theatre of Pompey), and the

the splendid equestrian statue in gilt bronze of Marcus Aurelius escaping the rapacity of the Byzantine, as it were, by miracle. This statue stood on the Lateran Field (*Campus Lateranensis*) east of the basilica, the place of the Emperor's birth and early education, and the site occupied in former days by the house of his grandfather Verus. The celebrated equestrian statue had been removed from the spot on which it had originally been placed; the spot itself had been converted into a vineyard; and it was not until 1538 that Paul III. had the monument transferred to the Capitol. If, in 663, the equestrian figure of Constantine still remained by the Arch of Septimius Severus, Constans no doubt carried it away in one of his vessels, and only as a favour did he yield to the entreaties of the Romans and leave them the bronze statue of Marcus Aurelius. Henceforward the clergy, no less than the ignorant populace, bestowed the name of Constantine the Great on the equestrian likeness of the Emperor in the Lateran, and as that of Constantine the statue was regarded throughout the whole course of the Middle Ages.[1]

bronze Athlete and the Hero were discovered in the Via Nazionale, within the ground belonging to the Baths of Constantine, in the spring of 1885.

[1] Although the *Anonymus* of Einsiedeln, who read the dedicatory inscription of the *equus Constantini* on its base by the Arch of Severus, is curiously silent regarding the equestrian statue of Marcus Aurelius by the Lateran, I nevertheless forsake the opinion expressed in the earlier editions of this volume, and now hold that the statue of M. Aurelius remained at the Lateran until 1538. This view has been put forward by Müllenhof, *Zeitschrift für Deutsch. Altert. von Moriz Haupt.*, Bd. xii. 325, and is followed by Jordan in the

The day of his departure the Emperor again attended mass at the grave of the Apostle, and taking leave of the Pope sailed to Naples with the plunder he had acquired. But neither Constans nor Constantinople were destined to enjoy the spoils of Rome. In ancient Syracuse, where he retired to the island of Ortygia, he remained, heaping up not only the taxes of Sicily, Calabria, Africa, and Sardinia, but even the altar-vessels plundered from the churches. Here four years later he was murdered; a stalwart slave striking him one day on the head with a copper vessel as he lay in his bath. The works of art, the spoils of his Roman sojourn, deposited in the island city, fell soon after into the hands of the Saracens when they conquered Syracuse. The illustrious city of Gelon and Hieron thus shared the fate of Athens and Rome, and Archradyna, Tyche, Neapolis, and Epipolae were reduced to mere depopulated ruins of bygone splendour.[1]

Syracuse.

*Topogr. Rom's.* It has also been established by Vincenzo Tizzani, *La Statua Equestre di Marco Aurelio*, Rome, 1880.

[1] The history of Syracuse in the Middle Ages is very obscure. Neither in the letter of the monk Theodosius, of the year 878 (*ad Leonam Archid. de Syracus. urb. Expugnat.*, Caruso, *Bibl. Sicul.*, I.), nor in Pirri, nor yet in Facello, is there any information, and even Michele Amari (*Storia dei Musulmanni in Sicilia*) gives us but little light. He says: *ratratta era la città nel nono secolo dal tempio di Giove Olimpico e dalle Epipoli alla penisola: ratratto l'umano ingegno da Gelone al Monaco Teodosio.* In the time of Constans the Temple of Minerva had already been converted into a church (the present cathedral) and dedicated to Maria Theotokos; it is scarcely probable, however, that the transformation had been effected by Belisarius (Pirri, *Sicil. Sacra*, ii. 123).

# CHAPTER VI.

1. Adeodatus Pope, 672—Restoration of the Monastery of S. Erasmus—Donus Pope, 676—Agathon Pope, 678—The Archbishop of Ravenna makes Submission to Rome—The Sixth Oecumenical Council—The Pestilence of 680—S. Sebastian—S. George—The Basilica *in Velo Aureo.*

Vitalian died towards the end of January 672, and was succeeded (April 11) by the Roman Adeodatus, son of Jovinian, whose four years' pontificate is devoid of importance in the history of the city.[1] He had been a monk in S. Erasmus on the Coelian, and restored this celebrated convent, which is reputed to have arisen during the sixth century in the house of the Valerii.[2] It was afterwards

Adeodatus Pope, 672–676.

[1] According to the *Lib. Pontif.*, he restored S. Peter in the Campus Meruli on the Via Portuensis. Bosio, *Roma Sotterr.*, ii. c. 20, 124, shows that in a Bull of John XIX. the Campus Meruli still bore its name. (It is now known as Campo Merlo in Portese.) Adeodatus died in the middle of June 676.

[2] Erasmus, a bishop in Campania, suffered martyrdom under Diocletian. *Martyrol.*, Usuardi, June 3. His martyrdom forms one of the most revolting subjects depicted by art; we may see and shudder at the painting of Nicholas Poussin in the Gallery of the Vatican. With regard to the monastery and house of the Valerii, see De Rossi, "La basil. di S. Stefano Rot.," &c., in the *Studi e Docum. di Storia e Diritto*, Rome, 1886, vii.

united with the Abbey of Subiaco, but fell to decay at some date unknown. Its ruins, however, with the remains of some ancient paintings, endured beside S. Stefano until near the end of the sixteenth century.[1]

Donus, 676–678.

Donus or Domnus, son of the Roman Maurice, succeeded Adeodatus on November 2, 676, but reigned little more than a year. The *Liber Pontificalis* informs us that he paved the Atrium of S. Peter's with great blocks of white marble, and, as it is scarcely probable that the quarries provided the required supply of costly material, we may infer that it was furnished by the despoiled monuments. In the Middle Ages it was asserted that the marble had been taken from the so-called Tomb of Scipio, afterwards known as that of Romulus, an ancient tomb of pyramidal form in the neighbourhood of S. Angelo.[2]

The history of Rome is at this period so dark and uneventful that it contains little more than the list of the Popes, the length of their reigns, and the churches which they built. Donus died in April 678,

[1] Ugonio, *le stazioni*, p. 291 ; Severano, *delle 7 Chiese*, p. 486.

[2] Nardini, iii. 367 ; Platina in *Dono*, i. This assertion is put forward by Peter Mallius in his work on the Basilica of S. Peter. The so-called Sepulcrum Scipionis is represented in the form of a pyramid on the bronze door of S. Peter. Donus also restored the church of S. Euphemia on the Via Appia. The celebrated saint of Chalcedon had a church within the city itself, a building situated in the Vicus Patricius, near the titular church of Pudens. Martinelli, *Roma ex eth.*, p. 357. Both churches have perished. The *Liber Pontif.* mentions, in the life of Donus, a Syrian monastery, Monasterium Boetianum. Did this building owe its foundation to Boethius, or had it merely arisen in his house ?

and was succeeded by Agathon, a native of Palermo,[1] a Pope who had the good fortune to obtain the recognition of Roman supremacy and orthodoxy, both in West and East. This supremacy had already been contested in the time of Vitalian by Maurus, Archbishop of Ravenna; who, encouraged by the strained relations then existing between Rome and Constantinople, had refused obedience to the Pope. A schism had broken out, which was furthered by the Emperor Constans, who was then in Syracuse. Furnished with the *privilegium* of entire independence from the Patriarch of Rome, granted him by the Emperor, Maurus and his successor Reparatus treated the papal anathemas with utter contempt.[2] Nevertheless, as early as the time of Donus, the new Emperor, Constantine Pogonatus, having declared himself favourable to Roman Catholicism, the Archbishop of Ravenna was obliged to yield, and Theodore, successor of Reparatus, renounced the *autocephalia*, or independence claimed by Ravenna, and allowed himself to be consecrated by Agathon. The victory over the most powerful metropolitan of Italy, that of Rome excepted, was of vital importance to the position of the Papacy,[3]

Agathon Pope, 678–682.

[1] Consecrated June or July 678; buried in S. Peter's on January 10, 681 (Jaffé).

[2] Agnellus, *Observ. on the Vita Mauri*, gives the Privilegium of Constans to the Church of Ravenna, dated *Kal. Martias Syracusa.* It is said therein: *sancimus amplius securam atque liberam ab omni superiori Episcopali conditione manere—et non subjacere pro quolibet modo Patriarchae Urbis Romae, sed manere eam* αὐτοκεφάλην. Gregory was Exarch at this time (666).

[3] Even in the ninth century Agnellus expresses the jealousy of Ravenna. After having described the subjection of Theodore, he

the rising power of which was further increased by the triumph obtained over the doctrines of the Monothelites. With the view of putting an end to this tedious controversy, Constantine Pogonatus had summoned an Oecumenical Council at Constantinople, and Agathon had previously (March 27, 680) assembled a synod of Italian prelates, who elected the Bishops of Portus, Rhegium, and Paterno as their representatives. With these three deputies the Pope further associated three Cardinal legates. In his letters of introduction, Agathon excuses himself for sending men who were neither eloquent nor learned, but who, in evil times and in the midst of barbarians, had been obliged to earn their bread by the work of their hands.[1] This honourable admission allows us to perceive the condition of learning in Rome at the period. Ignorant, however, although the presbyters may have been, they succeeded in winning the victory for the orthodox faith at Constantinople.

The celebrated sixth Oecumenical Council was opened in the Trullus or Hall of the Cupola, in the Palace of Byzantium, on November 7, 680. The decrees of Rome were pronounced canonical, and dead and living Monothelites laid down their arms, or, after obstinate resistance, continued through many sittings, were declared vanquished. The theological drama, which numbered eighteen Acts

adds: *cum multa alacritate Sacerdotum, et omnium gratulatione humo submersus est, in Ardica B. Apollinaris subtus jacet.* See close of the *Vita Theodori.*

[1] Ep. Agathonis, in Labbé, *Concil. D.*, viii. 655.

or Actiones, as in official style they were called, lasted until September 16, 681. George, Patriarch of Constantinople, remorsefully acknowledged his errors; Macarius of Antioch, however, remaining defiant, was deposed and banished. The dead professors of One Will in One Christ, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, and Pyrrhus of Byzantium, were solemnly anathematised, and their mosaic portraits in the churches were defaced. Pope Honorius himself, in the anathema pronounced against him, had to expiate in his grave his forbearance towards the Monothelites.[1] A dense cloud of black cobwebs then fell upon the people, in token that heresy was conquered. Christendom was now enlightened or set at rest concerning the Two Wills, and the Roman Church recognised as its dogmatic head.

Pestilence in Rome, 680.

Pestilence almost depopulated Rome in the summer of 680, and apparently raged throughout the rest of Italy, since Paulus Diaconus tells us that Pavia was almost entirely depopulated.[2] He asserts

[1] *Non quidem ut haereticus, sed ut haereticorum fautor.* Franz Pagi, *Breviar.*, p. 243, xviii., and *Lib. Pont.*, "Vita S. Leonis," ii. n. 148. The unique instance of a Roman Pope being publicly anathematised on the charge of heresy by an Oecumenical Council constitutes one of the most remarkable facts in ecclesiastical history. The recollection of the circumstance undoubtedly faded with the eighth century, but was revived in the sixteenth, and in our own times the condemnation of Honorius has formed a weapon in the hands of the opponents of the Jesuitical dogma of Papal Infallibility. "More has been written on this one subject (that of Honorius) in Church history in the space of a hundred and fifty years than on any other topic in fifteen hundred." Döllinger, on Honorius, *Papstfabeln des Mittelalters*, 1863.

[2] Paul. Diacon., vi. c. 5.

that the angels of good and evil were beheld passing through the streets; that at whatever door the good angel made a sign, the evil struck with his lance, and that death followed every blow. At length the belief became current, that were an altar erected to S. Sebastian, in the church of S. Peter ad Vincula, the pestilence would cease. Relics of the martyr were sent for to Rome, and the plague disappeared. Paulus Diaconus evidently referred to the church of S. Petrus ad Vincula in Pavia; the Romans of a later date, however, claimed the legend for their own church, where it has been embodied in a painting of the fifteenth century.

A rough mosaic of Byzantine style, probably due to the time of Agathon, still exists in the left aisle of this basilica. Sebastian is here represented clothed and as an aged man. Not until much later was he depicted as a youth, naked, bound to a tree, and pierced by arrows.[1]

S. Sebastian.

Sebastian had long been worshipped in Rome; a church over the Catacombs of Calixtus, which afterwards became one of the seven principal churches of Rome, having existed as early as the time of Gregory the Great. The saint, a young military tribune, a native of Narbonne, had professed Christianity, and had been made a target for the archers in the Imperial Palace. On his death, Lucina, a pious matron, caused his remains to be interred in the Catacombs of Calixtus.[2]

[1] He is thus depicted by Sodoma in the beautiful picture in the Uffizii at Florence.

[2] Surius, *de probat. Sanctor. Hist.*, Cologne, 1570, tom. i. 434–452,

Another military tribune had also already obtained the honour of an altar in Rome, namely, George of Cappadocia, a martyr under Diocletian. According to legend, he had been Comes of the cavalry; with audacious candour had admonished the Emperor against any further persecution of the Christians, and had heroically borne the most appalling tortures. After having endured the weight of a heavy stone on his breast throughout an entire night, he was condemned to be slowly torn to pieces by an iron-toothed wheel. While patiently undergoing the sentence, a flash of lightning rent the heavens, and a voice was heard, crying, "Fear not, George, for I am with thee": a white-robed figure stood by the wheel and gently folded the sufferer in his arms. The account of the miracle so deeply impressed the mind of the Empress Alexandra as to effect her conversion. George remained three days in a burning lime-pit; but fire, red-hot shoes, and a magic poison proved powerless to harm him. On the contrary, he showed himself still able to recall the dead to life in the very presence of the Emperor, and to overthrow the statues in the Temple of Apollo by his mere command. Finally, he suffered death by the sword of the executioner.[1] S. George.

on the 20th January. Cardinal Wiseman, who makes use of the legend in his tale of Fabiola, allows himself to deviate from facts, a liberty for which he ought to ask the pardon of both martyrs and martyrologists.

[1] Since the head of Paul had fallen under the sword, no other martyr had the strength to resist the power of the executioner. *Virtus christianorum nonnisi in ferro vincitur*, says the *legenda aurea* in the life of S. Euphemia. The legend of S. George is one of the most popular of this species of fiction. *Acta Sanctor.*, on the 23rd April.

Sebastian and George, in the course of time, became the favourite saints of chivalry, the Dioscuri, as it were, of the Christian mythology.[1] S. George, depicted on horseback with shield and spear, in the act of rescuing a beautiful maiden from the clutches of a dragon, bears a striking resemblance to the Pagan Perseus.[2] The church dedicated to his memory in the Velabrum was probably built by Leo II. in 682; and a basilica to S. George, with the title *Ad Sedem*, is mentioned as early as the time of Gregory I.[3]

S. George in Velabro.

The designation *Velum auri*, which had supplanted that of the ancient *Velabrum*, was borne by the valley lying between the Capitol and the Palatine, which, in ancient times a marsh, had afterwards been drained.[4] Here, as we are informed by an inscription

[1] Apparitions of S. George, of Theodore, and of Mercurius were very common during the period of the Crusades. The Church was accustomed to invoke, in the conflict with the unbeliever, Maurice, Sebastian, and George, as we see from the *Ordo Roman. ad armandum Eccl. Defensor. vel alium Militem.*

[2] Jacobus de Voragine, Archbishop of Genoa (died 1298), in his *Legenda Sanctor.* (called *Hist. Lombardica* and *aurea*, first printed in Nuremburg), weaves the life of the martyrs into a set of popular romances. He relates that a King exposed his daughter to a dragon at Silena, in Libya, that S. George came on horseback to the rescue of the princess, and set her free. Justinian had already dedicated a church to the saint, who had also obtained possession of the Temple of Ares in Athens.

[3] S. Gregor., Ep. 68, ix.: *ecclesiam S. Georgii, positam in loco qui ad sedem dicitur.* The Janus Quadrifrons, a haunt of money-changers, should be brought into connection with the expression *ad sedem.* True, the little Goldsmith's Arch also stands close to the church, but the district must assuredly have derived its name from the larger building.

[4] The inscription of a certain Abbot Stephen in the entrance-hall of the church says: *Hic locus ad velum praenomine dicitur auri.* As

on the Goldsmith's Arch, stood the Forum Boarium, and the spot, surrounded by ancient, well-preserved monuments, is, in its desertion, one of the most interesting in Rome. Beside it rises the imposing mass of Janus Quadrifrons, opposite the arch erected by the Roman goldsmiths to the Emperor Septimius Severus, his infamous sons, Caracalla and Geta, and the most unfortunate of mothers, Julia Pia. The Cloaca Maxima flows close by, and the ancient fountain Juturna, now, however, known by the name of S. George, still gushes forth beside it.[1]

If the inscription over the entrance of the ancient church speaks truth, the building was originally erected on the spot occupied in former times by the Basilica of Tiberius Sempronius. This, however, is an archaeological invention of later times.[2] The triumphal arch was annexed to the basilica, or, more properly speaking, the tower of the church was added to the monument.

The building of Leo II. (the portico is of later date) still preserves its original outlines, and is a small basilica of three naves with sixteen ancient columns, some granite, some marble. Scarcely any other church within the city is so pervaded by the atmosphere of

late as 482 the ancient name was still well known. De Rossi, *Inscript. Christian. Urbis Romae*, i. n. 878: LOCVS AVGVSTI LECTORIS DE BELABRV. . . .

[1] According to George Fabricius, *Antiq.*, p. 21, the Janus Quadrifrons was known in the Middle Ages as the *casa di Boetio*. The name probably originated with some noble family who fortified the arch. At any rate, an Aegidius Boetii lived in the thirteenth century. *Vita Gregor.*, Murat., iii. 582.

[2] The inscription runs: *Basilica Semproniana S. Georgii Milit. Mart. in Velabro*, Martinelli, p. 106, followed by Ugonio, p. 18.

early Christian times. The original form of the church, that of a basilica, its simplicity, its sculptures, its inscriptions, some of them in Greek dating from the first centuries of Christianity, its air, but rarely broken, of spell-bound tranquillity, its situation in the valley between the Capitol and Palatine hallowed by so many historic associations, combine to form a powerful impression on the imagination of the beholder. S. George in Velabro is, among the Roman basilicas, the pendant to the little temples of Vesta and Fortuna Virilis of antiquity. The tribune of the church was apparently originally covered with mosaics, which were afterwards replaced by paintings. Christ is represented on the globe between Peter and Paul; at the left stands Sebastian, at the right George, a banner in his hand and his horse beside him.[1]

The Greek saint, the representative of the ancient Mars, never, however, obtained any popularity among the now effete and unchivalrous Romans. The Popes who founded and encouraged his worship were not Romans, but Greeks, and the churches built in his honour, with the solitary exception of the basilica in the Velabrum, one and all fell to decay.[2] On the other hand, the saint in later times became the patron of knighthood in Genoa and Venice, in Spain, England, and in the chivalrous country of the Franks.[3]

[1] S. George was revered as Duke of the Christian people. The Roman Senate in the Middle Ages celebrated his festival on the 23rd April, offering him the gift of a chalice.

[2] Martinelli and Armellini speak of churches of S. George in Martio, in Specis, in Vaticano.

[3] Letters from the recent Abyssinian Expedition (1868) inform us that S. George is worshipped as patron saint even in Abyssinia.

## 2. LEO II., 682—BENEDICT II.—CONDITIONS OF THE PAPAL ELECTIONS—JOHN V.—FACTIONS AT THE ELECTION OF HIS SUCCESSOR—CONON—CLERGY, ARMY, AND PEOPLE—SERGIUS I.—THE EXARCH PLATINA COMES TO ROME, 687.

Leo II. was elected to the Papacy on August 17, 682, a year and seven months after the death of Agathon. The *Liber Pontificalis* informs us that the new Pope was ordained by the Bishops of Ostia, Portus, and Velitrae, the last of whom appeared as representative of the Bishop of Albano. From this it follows that the consecration of the Pope by the three suburban bishops had already been accepted as a canonical usage.[1] Leo II. was a Sicilian Greek. The knowledge of Greek and of Greek literature had by this time so entirely died out that acquaintance with them was looked on as something extraordinary, and the Pope who spoke Greek as well as Latin was regarded as a phenomenon of learning. Leo only lived until the summer of 683. Leo II., 682–683.

The long vacancy of the sacred chair which followed—Benedict II., a Roman, not being ordained until a year after the death of his predecessor—leads us to suppose that disturbances must have arisen in Benedict II., 684–685.

[1] Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.*, ii.; *Comment. in Ordin. Rom.*, cxviii., refutes the opinion of Sigonius, namely, that previous to the time of Leo II. only one bishop, the Bishop of Ostia, consecrated the Pope. The Bishop of Ostia placed the Gospels on the neck, and laid his hands on the head of the pontiff; the Bishop of Albano began the first oration: *Adesto supplicationibus nostris;* the Bishop of Portus chanted the second: *Propitiare Domine. Ordo Roman.*, xiv., in Mabillon, p. 272; Titul. vii. of the *Liber Diurnus.*

Rome or Ravenna. Since, in accordance with custom, it was necessary to obtain the ratification of each successive Pope either from the Exarch or direct from the Emperor, the process of election was necessarily tedious and costly; and since, moreover, the church of Rome was thereby rendered dependent on the Byzantine court, the Popes strove to rid themselves of the irksome formality. They were not, however, successful, although Benedict II. is said to have obtained an Imperial rescript, which conceded to the clergy, people, and army of Rome, that is, to the three electoral bodies, permission immediately to ordain the Pope they had already chosen. This important concession could, however, only be regarded as a temporary permission of the orthodox Emperor Constantine Pogonatus, and was regarded as such by his successors.[1] Constantine had apparently some personal relations with Benedict of which we are now ignorant; he allowed his two sons, Justinian and Heraclius, to be adopted by the Pope, sending to Benedict, according to the curious custom of the time, locks of the hair of both princes; symbols of adoption which were solemnly deposited in a chapel of the Lateran.[2]

[1] *Hic suscepit divalem jussionem clement. principis Constantini ad vener. clerum, et pop. atque feliciss. exercitum Rom. civitatis, per quam concessit, ut qui electus fuerit in sede Ap., e vestigio absque tarditate Pontifex ordinaretur.* Baronius exclaims: *restituta Romana ecclesia in pristinam libertatem!* This, however, was not the case, as is evident from history, the *Liber Diurnus* and the *professiones fidei* addressed to the same Emperor, therein contained. See, on this point, O. Lorenz., *Papstwahl und Kaisertum*, Berlin, 1874, p. 26.

[2] The youthful Pipin was adopted by King Liutprand by the cutting of his locks. The cutting of the beard also served as the

The rapidity with which Pope succeeded Pope at this period is a curious and even sinister phenomenon. Pontificates of thirteen and more years, like those of Gregory the Great, Honorius I., and Vitalian, form exceptions to the rule; the greater number of Popes in the sixth and seventh centuries reigned only one, two, or three years. Whether these men were only elected in extreme old age, or whether there were darker causes to account for the brevity of their reigns, we do not know. Benedict II. died on May 7, 685, and John V., a Syrian from Antioch, previously Nuncio at Constantinople, ascended the sacred chair, but died as early as August 1, 686. With John begins a series of Syrians or Greeks who successively filled the papal throne; a circumstance which could scarcely have been the result of accident, but rather shows that the election lay entirely in the hands of Exarch or Emperor.

John V., 685–686.

Rome divided into two factions on the question of the succession to John V., the clergy favouring the Arch-presbyter Peter, the army the Arch-presbyter Theodore. The so-called army (Exercitus) met for deliberation in S. Stephen on the Coelian, and occupied the Lateran, in order to prevent the clergy from conducting their candidate to the episcopal throne. After tedious negotiations between the opposing parties, the clergy renounced their

Contested election.

symbol of adoption. Paul. Diacon., vi. 53. These locks of hair were named Mallones (from μαλλός). The Exarch Gregory, after having enticed Taso and Caco, sons of Duke Gisulf of Forli, to his presence, under the pretext of adopting them, murdered both. The treacherous barber kept his promise; he shaved Taso's beard, but not until his head was severed from his body. Paul. Diacon., iv. 38.

candidate, and elected Conon, a Thracian. The judges (*judices*) and the leaders of the army joined his side, and soon obtained the assent of the entire army; the acts of election were then signed by the three elective orders and forwarded to the Exarch Theodore.

The three electoral bodies in Rome.

From the detailed account which is given us in the *Liber Pontificalis*, it is evident that the population of Rome was at this time divided into three great classes, viz., clergy, army, and people; classes which we have already seen specified, in Constantine's rescript to Benedict II., as the corporations recognised in the papal elections. To the clergy was assigned the title *venerabilis*, to the army *felicissimus*, and clergy and army formed the two most powerful classes in Rome. They had been called into existence by the Christian Church, which created a caste of clergy, so disproportionately numerous, and soon so powerful, that the entire population naturally became divided into clergy and laity. On the occasion of the reception of the hair of the Greek princes by the Pope, the clergy and the army are alone mentioned. This army, still in the pay of the Emperor, as we have seen during the insurrection of Maurice, consisted of nobles, who served as *milites* on horseback, and well-to-do citizens, who served on foot. The Exercitus, therefore, represented the prosperous classes in general; and, roughly speaking, may be said to have included in its ranks the entire population of free citizens in Rome.[1] We shall later see, as in the eighth century,

[1] *Lib. Diurnus*, tit. iv.: *viros honestos cives, et de exercitali gradu;*

how the *Schola Militiae* or the *florentissimus atque felicissimus Romanus Exercitus* was constituted in detail. In the meantime, we perceive that the entire military body exercised their franchise apart from the leaders of the army, who, nevertheless, formed the aristocracy of the Exercitus. They followed the clergy in proclaiming Conon, the army only yielding their consent after some days' delay. Next to the *primates exercitus*, we find the *judices* or civil judges. These were the higher officials, as well as the aristocracy in general, who boasted rights to civil and military offices, and who bore occasionally the consular title. Judices and Primates Exercitus, therefore, constituted the nobility of Rome (*Optimates* or *Axiomati*) a civil and military official hierarchy. They corresponded to the body

in tit. ii., *Clerus, Optimates et Milites seu cives* sign the act of election. The election took place as follows: *convenientib. nobis, ut moris est* (*saec.* 7), *cunctis sacerdotib. ac procerib. eccl., et univ. clero, atque optimatib., et universa militari praesentia, seu civib. honestis, et cuncta generalitate populi istius a deo servatae Romanae urbis.* It is difficult to decide the exact relations expressed by the particles "*et*" and "*seu.*" I am, on the whole, inclined to believe that the *optimates* stood to the *milites* in the same relation as the *proceres ecclesiae* to the *sacerdotes*, and that the *cives hon.* equally stood out from the *generalitas pop.* I punctuate thus: *cunctis sacerdotib. ac procer. eccl. et univ. clero; atque optimatib. et univ. militari praesentia; seu civib. honestis et cuncta generalitate populi.* The *Miles* was essentially a cavalry soldier; he served on horseback. Hegel, i. 248, attempts to prove that the *Milites* and *Cives* were entirely distinct, forming a third and fourth class, and holds that the *cives hon.* were merely the *populus* or *plebs.* According to Marini, *Pap. Dipl.*, n. 112, 113, people carrying on an industry are found as *viri honesti*; but must not these men have belonged to the Exercitus? If the nobles served on horseback, who were the Romans who served on foot? Assuredly citizens capable of bearing arms.

of the army exactly as the Proceres of the Church to the body of the clergy.[1]

The *Judices de militia* (the lay nobility) were distinguished from the *Judices de clero*, ecclesiastical dignitaries who administered jurisdiction in other provinces. They formed at this period a new order of nobility in Rome. Since the fall of the Empire the ancient Roman families had in great part disappeared. The names of patrician families familiar to us in Gothic times are no longer discovered. The Probi, Festi, Petronii, Maximi, Venantii, Importunati, have for ever faded from history. In their place other names with a Byzantine ring, such as Paschalis, Sergius, John, Constantine, Paul, Stephen, Theodore, had crept into use, and remained common in the city even during the ninth century. These are undoubtedly to be explained by the ruling influence of the Byzantines; for although some of these names may have been received in baptism, others clearly prove an immigration of Greeks, who had permitted themselves to become naturalised in

[1] Tit. v., *Lib. Diurn.: convenientib. Sacerdotib., et reliquo omni clero, eminent. consulib. et glor. judicib., ac universitate civium et florentis Romani exercitus*—here, probably as their civil judges, consuls and judices stand side by side with the citizens. To this division corresponds the form of election customary in other towns from the time of Odoacer: *Clero, Ordini et Plebi*, as in Rimini, Terracina, Perusia, Croton, and in Ravenna, as we see by Gregory's letters: Ep., 56, i.; 58, i.; 14, 27, ii.; 21, iv. There is not, however, any mention there of an army. In Naples the *nobiles* were added to the rest: *Clero, Nobilibus, Ordini et Plebi:* 3, ii. The Ordo, of which nothing is heard in Rome, was, as Hegel believes, the ancient Curia, which had split into aristocracy, landowners, &c.

Rome. In the course of time, owing to conditions of property, through Imperial or ecclesiastical dignities, and even thus early through papal nepotism, new families were constantly rising to the surface. There were also in Rome the descendants of many noble Gothic houses who had gradually become Latinised. From the ranks of the nobility, however, were elected, in the capacity of Judices, the chief dignitaries both of Church and State.

The Acts of Conon's election were, "according to custom," sent to the Exarch for examination and ratification, which proves that the concession of the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus no longer existed as a right. It had, in fact, been revoked by his successor Justinian II.; but how great the influence of the Exarchs remained on the papal election is proved by the following facts. Conon was ill; his death was expected, and Paschalis, his ambitious arch-deacon, hurried to the Exarch to sue for the succession and to offer a gift of money in exchange. John Platina agreed, charging the judices whom he had appointed for Rome to procure the election of Paschalis.[1]

Fresh schism on account of the election.

On the death of the noble and enlightened Conon (September 21, 687), the Romans again split into two factions; one choosing the Arch-presbyter Theodore, the other the Arch-deacon Paschalis. Both competitors, together with their adherents, took up their abode in the Lateran Palace. We are not precisely informed to which classes the contending

[1] *Suis judicibus, quos Romae ordinavit et direxit ad disponendam civitatem. Lib. Pont.* in Conon., n. v.

factions belonged, but only know that the judices and primates of the army sided with the dignitaries of the Church, the secular with the spiritual nobility.[1] Together they agreed to elect the Presbyter Sergius, and succeeded by force in installing their candidate in the Lateran. Theodore voluntarily did homage to the Pope-elect; Paschalis, however, yielded but a forced renunciation, and privately sent messengers to Ravenna to summon the Exarch to his aid.

Sergius I., 687–701.

Hastening to Rome, where his arrival was wholly unexpected,[2] John Platina convinced himself that the election of Sergius was canonical, and that the majority was in his favour. He exacted, however, from the Pope-designate a hundred pounds of gold; for so much had Paschalis promised to pay him out of the ecclesiastical treasury. Sergius was reluctantly compelled to hand over the required sum, and, in return, received the ratification of the Exarch, and consecration on December 15, 687. His opponent Paschalis was deposed and banished to a monastery.

[1] *Lib. Pont.*, *inito consilio, primates judicum et exercitus Romanae militiae, vel cleri seditiosi pars plurima et praesertim sacerdotum, atque civium multitudo:* the multitude of citizens, that is to say, of those who did not serve in the army.

[2] *Qui sic abdite venit, ut nec signa, nec banda cum militia Romani exercitus occurrissent et juxta consuetudinem in competenti loco, nisi in propinquo Romanae civitatis.* *Lib. Pont.* in Sergio, n. 159.

### 3. SERGIUS REJECTS THE ARTICLES OF THE TRULLAN SYNOD —ARRIVAL OF THE SPATHAR ZACHARIAS TO DEPOSE THE POPE—ENTRANCE OF THE RAVENNESE—RELATIONS OF RAVENNA TO ROME AND BYZANTIUM—JOHANNICIUS OF RAVENNA.

Sergius I., though born in Palermo, was of Syrian blood, his father Tiberius having forsaken Antioch for Sicily. Sergius had come to Rome as a youth during the pontificate of Adeodatus, had risen into prominence by his learning, had gradually reached the highest dignities, and had at length received the title of presbyter. Following in the steps of his predecessor, he resolutely opposed the doctrines of Byzantium. One and the same spirit animated each successive Pope: namely, the genius of ever aspiring dominion, which the Church had received as heir of the ancient Romans.[1] The sophistic spirit of the Greeks, inexhaustible in the generation of new theological doctrines, which, little though they may have redounded to the honour or advantage of humanity, served to sustain intellectual life, in vain brought all its weapons into action, in the endeavour to shake S. Peter's chair. They only rebounded from the powerful prosaic intellect of Rome, only aided the Popes in advancing the work of Western centralisation.

The city itself had grown accustomed to look upon the Pope as its head. To whom could the unfortunate people turn but to the holy bishop, who,

[1] Baronius was able to say: *Unus spiritus omnium Romanorum pontificum.*

through his position, had become the powerful head of Italy? And it was soon evident that the Pope could reckon upon the Romans. A few years after the succession of Sergius, the Trullan Council was held in Constantinople. The Byzantine theologians had announced that neither the Fifth nor the Sixth Synod had propounded a Canon of Discipline, and a Council was therefore summoned to frame one.[1] A hundred and two laws were promulgated, approved, and signed by the papal nuncios. These articles had been sent for ratification to Sergius, whose sharp eye, however, discovered among them some suspicious doctrines, such as the condemnation of celibacy among presbyters and deacons, the prohibition of Saturday fasts, and other rules, esteemed at that time of gravest import. The Pope refused his signature, and forbade the publication of the articles. The Emperor forthwith sent an official of high authority to Rome, who required two of the most respected prelates to accompany him back to Constantinople.

As the Romans allowed them to depart without any resistance, Justinian thought that he might venture a yet bolder stroke, and sent his Protospathar Zacharias to Rome with orders to fetch the Pope himself a prisoner to Constantinople. But the times of Martin were for ever past, and the authority of

[1] The date of this Council has disappeared together with the Acts. Pagi and Muratori assume that it was held in 691. Its name was derived from the cupola (*trullus*) of the palace. It was also called *Quini-Sextum*, from the circumstance that it was summoned to supplement the Fifth and Sixth Oecumenical Councils.

Byzantium suffered a moral defeat, not in Rome only, but throughout Italy, which showed that Greek rule could not long be maintained in the country. As the Imperial messenger departed for Rome to execute the commands of his sovereign, he was followed not only by the entire army of Ravenna, but by that also of the Duchy of Pentapolis, and in fact by the troops of all the other districts which lay between Ravenna and Rome, in order to defend the Pope. Here, for the first time, we find mention of the army of Ravenna, and in it discover, instead of a body of Greek mercenaries, a civic militia, animated with the spirit of Italian self-consciousness. On this occasion also occurs the first mention of the Duchy of the Pentapolis, that is to say, the district comprising the five maritime cities of Ancona, Sinigaglia, Fano, Pesaro, and Rimini.

The Italians take the part of the Pope against the Emperor.

The militia of these districts advanced to Rome, whither the Protospathar had already arrived. Giving the absurd order that the gates of the city should be closed, he fled for protection to the Pope's sleeping-room. The Ravennese, already within the city, surrounded the Lateran, and with shouts demanded to see the Pope, who, it was reported, had been seized by night and carried on board a vessel. The Palace was closed, the Pope within, the Byzantine crouching beneath his bed. The thoughts of Sergius on this pitiable occasion may have reverted to his predecessor Martin I., whose sad fate was thus avenged. He comforted the Spathar with the assurance that not a hair of his head should be hurt, then showed himself to the triumphant people

in front of the Lateran,[1] blessed the liberators and calmed their indignation, and, amid cries of derision from the populace, the Imperial messenger left the city.

The day that witnessed this event, as showing how great and national the power of the Papacy had become, was one of the most important in its history up to the time of which we speak. The power was the result of a work silently accomplished, namely, of the energy with which the Popes had united the various provinces of Italy in an ecclesiastical organisation, which they had rendered subject to the sacred chair. It was further the result of the long struggle of East and West concerning dogma, and of the interference of the Byzantine Emperor in the affairs of the Romish Church. It would, nevertheless, be impossible wholly to explain the expedition of the Ravennese in the absence of any special co-operating causes, amongst which the subjection of the archbishop to papal supremacy, a work accomplished by Leo II., was the most important. These events took place, however, in 692 or 694, at the time when the peace-loving Damian filled the archiepiscopal chair, and when, moreover, the inhabitants of Ravenna, irritated by Byzantine rule, were meditating revolt.

An illustrious Ravennese named Johannicius seems to have been the chief of the conspirators. His talents and acquirements, more especially his knowledge of Greek, had attracted the attention of the

[1] *Egressus—foris basilicam D. Theodori Papae apertis januis sedens in sede, quae vulgo appellatur sub Apostolis.* This is the oratory of S. Sebastian, built by Theodore.

Exarch Theodore, whose secretary he became. From this post he was summoned to the Byzantine court. He now returned to Ravenna, and we presently find his son George heading his rebellious fellow-townsmen. A revolution in Constantinople, however, preceded the rising in the Exarchate. In 695 the cruel Justinian had been dethroned by Leontius, dragged to the Hippodrome, and there, with Byzantine cruelty, had been deprived of ears and nose. Some citizens of Ravenna took part in this military insurrection, an offence never forgotten by Justinian.[1]

[1] Agnellus, *Vita S. Felicis*, c. 2, 353, *sq.*

## CHAPTER VII.

1. S. Peter's — Pilgrimages to Rome — Cadwalla receives Baptism, 689—Conrad and Offa take the Cowl—Sergius adorns the Churches with Offerings—Tomb of Leo I. in S. Peter's.

Growing importance of S. Peter's.

The importance of Rome as the head of the Church, and the reverence for the Apostle Peter and his successors on the papal chair, meanwhile grew and strengthened, until, in time, the mythic tomb of the poor Galilean fisherman in the sumptuous basilica became the chief sanctuary of the West. In the days of Prudentius barbarians had not yet made their way across the Alps and seas to visit Roman shrines, but after the middle of the seventh century, the city became yearly thronged with thousands of pilgrims from the distant lands of Gaul, Spain, and Britain. Rome had again become the centre of the desire of nations, though from other needs than those of ancient times, when Seneca so eloquently described the supernatural spell which the Eternal City exercised over the minds of men.[1] Relics of the sainted dead were now the magnet which drew countless wanderers from distant lands and enabled

[1] See his letter to his mother Helvia.

them to overcome difficulties indescribable; their goal, a grave; their reward, a prayer offered up before it, a relic, and the hope of a future paradise. No sooner did these pilgrims arrive within sight of Rome than they threw themselves on their knees as before an Eden of bliss; singing hymns, they entered the city of their dreams, sought the houses for the pilgrims, and there found shelter and countrymen who spoke their own tongue and acted as guides on their visits to the churches and catacombs. Returned home, they became so many missionaries of the faith; they spread abroad marvellous accounts of the beauty of the Sacred City, inflamed the longing of others, were thus instrumental in uniting West and North with Rome, and bound mankind, more effectually than political ties ever could have done, to the "Mother of nations."

The houses for pilgrims.

It was more particularly the but recently converted Angles who were drawn to Rome by zeal for the faith. In 689 Cadwalla, King of the West Saxons, became there an object of the most enthusiastic admiration. After fierce contests with the Scots, the young hero sheathed his sword and set forth for distant Rome, to receive baptism at the hands of the Pope. The Romans had formerly been accustomed to behold kings from distant lands, either led as captives in triumphal procession, or in the attitude of suppliant vassals before their tribunals. Their descendants now for the first time beheld a foreign barbarian monarch in their city as a pilgrim, and saw him conducted by the Pope to the Baptistery of the Lateran. There stood the long-haired Cad-

Cadwalla makes a pilgrimage to Rome, 689.

walla on Easter Eve, clad in white, a lighted taper in his hand, and there, from the mythic porphyry basin of Constantine, received baptism and the name of Peter. Unnerved, perhaps, by the strange ceremony, or affected by the climate, the tamed Saxon hero fell a prey to illness, and died on the Sunday in Albis (the 20th April). He was buried by the Romans in the atrium of S. Peter's, and a magniloquent epitaph, which still remains, records that Cadwalla had crossed the seas from the further ends of Britain, and travelled through foreign lands and peoples to visit the city of Romulus and the temple dedicated to Peter, in order to lay mystic gifts at the Apostle's grave; that he had forsaken riches and throne, his mighty kingdom, his children, triumphs and spoils, his ancestors, cities, fortresses, and household gods for the love of God, to gaze as a royal guest on the seat of Peter, and that he had at length exchanged an earthly for a heavenly kingdom.[1]

[1] The epitaph is given in Bede, *Hist. Eccl. Gentis Anglor.*, v. c. 7; also in Paul. Diacon., vi. c. 15, and more correctly in t. v., *Classicor. Auctor.* of Angelo Mai, p. 404. The author was probably Benedict, Archbishop of Milan. I quote some lines from the beginning and middle of the inscription:—

*Culmen, opes, sobolem, pollentia regna, triumphos,*
*Exuvias, proceres, moenia, castra, lares;*
*Quaeque patrum virtus, et quae congesserat ipse*
*Caedual armipotens, liquit amore Dei,*
*Ut Petrum, sedemque Petri Rex cerneret hospes . . .*
*Sospes enim veniens supremo ex orbe Britanni*
*Per varias gentes, per freta, perque vias,*
*Urbem Romuleam vidit templumque verendum*
*Aspexit Petri, mystica dona gerens. . . .*

*Hic depositus est Caedual, qui et Petrus, Rex Saxonum, sub die*

Pilgrimage of Coenred and Offa.

The appearance of Cadwalla is indicative of the future of Rome; it typifies, that is to say, the subjugation of the Teutonised West to the spiritual power of the Pope. The pious example was emulated. Only twenty years later, two other English Kings, Coenred of Mercia and Offa of the East Saxons, arrived in Rome, where, renouncing worldly wealth and honours, as the early followers of Christianity had done, they came, not to be baptised, for they were already Christians, but to exchange the purple for the habit of the monk. Rome now for the first time witnessed kings kneeling at the Apostle's feet as suppliants for the cowl. Their long waving hair was cut off and dedicated to S. Peter; their royal youth was buried in the white frock of monasticism, and the princes from Arthur's heroic island deemed themselves fortunate in being permitted to disappear from sight, amid a swarm of obscure monks, in one of the convents near S. Peter's, with the prospect of a grave in the atrium of the basilica, and a place among the blessed in heaven.[1] The Church thus drew within herself the fresh en-

*duodecimo Kalendarum Maiarum, Indictione secunda; qui vixit annos plus minus triginta. imperante Domno Justiniano piissimo Augusto, anno et Consulatus quarto, pontificante Apostolico viro Domno Sergio Papa anno secundo.* Cadwalla's baptism and death in Rome are also mentioned in the "Carmen Aldhelmi de Basilica aedificata a Bugge filia regis Angliae," in Angelo Mai, *ibid.*, p. 388. Aldhelm (who died 709) writes Ceduvalla, and ingenuously says:

*Alta supernorum conquirens regna polorum*
*Clarum stelligeri conscendens culmen Olympi.*

[1] *Lib. Pont.*, "Vita Constant.," and Bede, v. c. 20. These Kings died in Rome a short time after.

thusiasm of the North; she represented this example of royal renunciation as one worthy the imitation of other princes, and by degrees Rome collected an English colony in the neighbourhood of the Vatican.

These royal penitents did not come with empty hands. On the contrary, together with their souls, they offered sums of money to S. Peter, and with every succeeding year the gifts of pilgrims, penitents, and believers from the West flowed more abundantly into ecclesiastical coffers, and furnished the Popes with means to adorn the churches with ever-increasing magnificence. Sergius was zealous in his endeavours to maintain the splendour of the basilicas, and to provide them with costly altar vessels. Art, or at least the art of the mosaic and metal-worker, remained in constant demand, and the laborious minuteness of Byzantine artists was emulated by those of Rome. Censers (*thymiateria*) were adorned with columns; the ciboria and tabernacles, containing the chalice over the altar, constructed in the form of little temples of porphyry, were covered with cupolas decorated with gold and precious stones.[1]

Sergius endowed the church of which he had been cardinal, that of S. Susanna on the Quirinal, with vast wealth; a fact of which an inscription in marble, recording the deed of gift to John, the cardinal presbyter, still remains to inform us.[2] He also

[1] *Cymelia* was the generic term used for the sacred vessels; under it were included lamps, vases, cups, chalices, censers, &c., of innumerable kinds.

[2] The fragments of this deed of gift have been pieced together and explained by De Rossi, *Bull. d. Arch. crist.*, 1870, p. 89, f.

erected a tomb to Pope Leo I., in S. Peter's, the inscription of which has been preserved.[1] This was the first tomb within the basilica itself, the Popes having hitherto either been buried in the cemeteries beyond the gates, or in the atrium of the Vatican basilica. But after Sergius had caused Leo the Great to be interred in the transept and erected an altar over his grave in 688, it became the custom to accord such Popes as were held in greatest esteem, not only burial, but worship in S. Peter's itself. The custom of primitive times, and that most in harmony with the principle of the Christian religion, the custom, namely, of having only one altar in a church, was thus abandoned.

[1] It ends :—

*Sergius antistes divino impulsus amore*
*Nunc in fronte sacrae transtulit inde domus.*
*Exornans rutilum pretioso marmore tumbum.*
*In quo poscentes mira superna vident.*
*Et quia praemicuit miris virtutibus olim,*
*Ultima Pontificis gloria major erit.*

—Gruter, 1170, n. 4.

The rebuilding the oratory of S. Andreas on the Via Labicana is the only work of the kind attributed to Pope Sergius.

2. John VI., 701—The Exarch Theophylactus comes to Rome—The Italian Militia advances before the City—Restoration of the Abbey of Farfa—Gisulf II. of Benevento invades the Campagna—John VII., 705—Justinian II. reascends the Byzantine Throne—John VII.'s Oratory in S. Peter's—S. Veronica's Handkerchief—Subiaco restored.

John VI., 701–705.

Sergius died on September 7, 701, and, after a short interval, was succeeded on October 30 by John VI., a Greek. Tiberius Apsimar, who, four years previously, had overcome the usurper Leontius, at this time occupied the throne of Byzantium. We cannot explain the cause of the Emperor's hostile attitude towards Rome; we only know that he sent thither the Exarch Theophylactus from Sicily, and that the militia from the different Italian provinces forthwith arrived in defence of the city. Latin patriotism was aroused; the dominion of Byzantium was nearing its end. The militia lay encamped outside the city walls; the population was in revolt within; the Pope, however, ordered the gates to be closed, and his envoys, having induced the Italians to retire, effected the escape of the Exarch.[1] John's attitude on this occasion proves him to have been a man of shrewdness and foresight. Although already wielding a greater influence over Italian affairs than

[1] *Apud fossatum, in quo in unum convenerant.* *Fossatum* is a camp surrounded by a ditch. In the life of John VI. the expression is used to denote the camp of the Lombards. Whether or not the event belongs to the year 702, I must leave undecided.

the Exarchs, the Popes as yet possessed no temporal power. They continued to acknowledge themselves subjects of the Emperor, cautiously acted as mediators in every revolution, and upheld the legitimate authority of the Empire. For the premature severance of Italy from Constantinople, which was now the seat of Roman Imperial authority, would only have redounded to the advantage of the Lombards, who were again threatening Rome.

The native savagery of the Lombards had by degrees been subdued by the influences of Italian civilisation: and their princes and bishops, converted from Arianism to the Catholic faith, were now the foremost champions of the Roman worship. They built churches and monasteries, where learning flourished under the care of Lombard monks. At the end of the seventh century, Farfa, an abbey which had previously suffered the fate of Monte Casino, arose from its ruins. Faroald, Duke of Spoleto, had been specially active in rebuilding this monastery, which, although situated in Sabine territory, belonged to the Lombard duchy of Spoleto,[1] the rulers of which province proved less dangerous to Rome than their rivals of Benevento.

The Abbey of Farfa.

We are ignorant of the motives which impelled the powerful Gisulf II. to invade Roman territory in the second or third year of John's pontificate. He here occupied Sora, Arpino, and Arce, devastated the

[1] Muratori, *ad Ann.* 683; Mabill., *Annal. Bened.*, xvii. c. 20, 561; *Chron. Farf.* and Muratori's Prolegom. to it; vol. ii., *Script.*, p. 2. In the archives of Farfa the formula invariably runs: *Monast. S. Dei genitr. Mariae quod situm est in territorio Sabin. in loco ubi dicitur Acutianus.*

banks of the Liris with fire and sword, and encamped near Horrea. John, however, by means of a heavy ransom, induced the duke to retreat. The possession of the towns in question, as situated on the frontier, was already a subject of dispute. Later, it would appear that they were not reckoned as belonging to the duchy of Benevento, and, when conquered by Gisulf, stood apparently either under the jurisdiction of the Roman commander, or, like Terracina and Gaeta, under that of the Sicilian Patricius.[1] Paulus Diaconus distinctly speaks of Sora as a city of the Romans, and with him, as with Procopius, Romans invariably stand for Greeks.[2] Ancient Latium, on the left bank of the Tiber, extended landwards beyond the Liris to these frontier towns; seawards, it stretched to Terracina.

On this, no more than on previous occasions, is there any mention either of an Imperial Dux, or yet of senators in Rome. It is again the Pope, who, instead of the Greek general, conducts the negotiations, and who, through his clergy, concludes the peace, which he pays for out of the funds belonging to the ecclesiastical treasury. John VI. died in

[1] The *Tabula Chorogr. Medii Aevi* of John Barretta (xx. n. 108) throws as little light on the subject as does Camillus Peregrinus' Dissert. iv., *de ducatu Benev.* Procop., *de bell. Goth.*, i. 15, represents the Roman territory as extending to Terracina: μεθ' οὓς Καμπανοὶ ἄχρι ἐς Ταρακήνην πόλιν οἰκοῦσιν, οὓς δὴ οἱ Ῥώμης ὅροι ἐκδέχονται.

[2] The *Lib. Pont.* only mentions the unknown Horrea.; Paul. Diacon., on the other hand, specifies *Suram, Romanorum civitatem, Hirpinos atque Arcem.* Cluver and Muratori read: *Soram, Arpinum, Arcem atque Aquinum.* Sora was a fortress of the Samnites; the ancient Arx or present Arce is situated near Arpino.

January 705, and left the Apostolic chair to the son of the Greek Plato, who was ordained as John VII. on March 1st. John VII., 705–707.

Under the reign of this Pope peaceful relations were re-established with the Lombards. King Aribert formally restored to the Roman Church the estates in the Cottian Alps seized by his predecessors.[1] The deed of gift, written in letters of gold, one of the most ancient documents of its kind, was sent to Rome. The relations with Constantinople, where the banished Justinian II. had succeeded in regaining possession of the throne in the autumn of 705, were, on the other hand, full of menace. Escaping from the Chersonese, where he had been living in exile, Justinian fled to the King of the Bulgarians, at the mouth of the Danube, and with his aid made himself master of Constantinople. Here he revelled in the blood of his enemies, whom he impaled, beheaded, and blinded by thousands. The terrible Rhinotmetus,[2] for so he was called by the Greeks after the loss of his nose, had scarcely regained the throne, when, recollecting the decrees of the Trullan Council, he sent them to Rome by the hands of two Metropolitans, to request the papal signature. John, it is true, refused, but lacking the courage to condemn the uncanonical articles, drew on himself the censures of the orthodox. His biographer discovers

[1] A restitution of ecclesiastical property, and by no means, as Baronius supposes, the donation of an entire province.

[2] The Emperor replaced the nose which he had lost by one of gold, and when he cleansed the latter, those who were present knew that an execution had been decided upon.

in this offence the cause of his death, which took place in October 707.

Chapel of John VII. in S. Peter's.

To John VII. are ascribed some buildings, which are in part associated with remarkable local legends. He erected a chapel in S. Peter's, and lined it with mosaics,[1] which, regarded at the time as the greatest ornament of the basilica, formed in truth the most important artistic achievement of the age. In the centre stands the Virgin,[2] at her right the Pope, his head crowned by a square nimbus, and the model of the chapel in his hands. Traces of figures, together with the ancient inscription, may still be seen in the crypt of the Vatican.[3] The walls of the oratory were also covered with mosaics, depicting S. Peter preaching in Jerusalem, Antioch, and Rome, the fall of Simon Magus, the deaths of Peter and Paul, and the history of the Saviour from His birth until His descent into Hades. The execution of these mosaics already shows the lamentable decline which had taken place in art, but the idea of decorating a chapel entirely with mosaics, and of representing the drama of Christianity in a series of actions, seems to us a conception so daring in this barbarous age as to call for attention. After an existence of nine hundred years, the chapel was pulled down in 1639, and the remains of the mosaics removed to S. Maria in Cosmedin. Here the time-

[1] These mosaics are described by Torrigio, *Le sacre grotte Vat.*, ii. 117.

[2] In 1609 this portrait was removed to the Ricci chapel in S. Marco at Florence (*Furietti de Musivis*, c. 5, p. 79).

[3] *Joannes indignus Episcopus fecit B. Dei Genitricis servus.*

honoured relics (now more than eleven hundred years old) remain, built into the walls of the Sacristy. Rough in execution though they be, they bear the stamp of an age, the pious simplicity and child-like faith of which it is scarcely possible for us to understand.[1]

John VII. is said to have also deposited the Handkerchief of Veronica within the chapel, where, in the tenth century, and assuredly much earlier, it was the object of universal veneration.[2] An inscription relating to the relic, and dating from John's time, still exists in the crypt of the Vatican, and, since the handkerchief was regarded in the Middle Ages as Rome's most precious possession, its history must here find a place.[3]

[1] Mary is here represented with the Child, veiled after the manner of the Greeks; an angel stands before the Virgin; behind her, a figure who offers a gift to the Child, and a second figure, perhaps Joseph. The work, executed on rough material, is as crude as that of the contemporary representation of S. Stephen in S. Pietro ad Vincula. Crescimbeni, *Storia della basilica di S. Maria in Cosmedin*, p. 145, gives an illustration of this mosaic.

[2] *Chron. Benedicti*, a monk of S. Andrea on Soracte (*Mon. German.*, v. c. 11): *Johannes praeerat papa, qui fecit oratorium sancte Dei genitricis, opere pulcerrimo, intra ecclesia b. Petri apostoli, ubi dicitur a Veronice.*

[3] With regard to the handkerchief (*Sindone*) there is a small literature. I must warn the reader, however, against the work of Alfonsus Palaeotus, *Jesu Christi Crucifixi Stigmata sacrae Sindoni impressa*, which gives an appalling representation of the Saviour's form. Christ having left His likeness on the funeral-sheet, every single wound is investigated with barbarous erudition. Alveri, *Roma in ogni stato*, ii. 210, and Severan., *le 7 Chiese*, p. 154, have given a circumstantial account of the history of the handkerchief. Karl Pearson, *Die Fronica, ein Beitrag z. Gesch. des Christusbildes im Mittelalter*, Strassburg, 1887.

Legend of S. Veronica's handkerchief.

Tiberius, afflicted with incurable leprosy, one day informed the senators that, being beyond the aid of man, he must have recourse to heaven. He had been told that a divine magician, named Jesus, dwelt in Jerusalem, and he ordered the patrician Volusianus immediately to repair thither and implore the renowned physician to accompany him back to the Imperial court. Storms delayed the arrival of the messenger for a whole year; and, on reaching Jerusalem, Volusian was met by Pilate with regrets that the Emperor had not sooner made known his desires, as the magician had already been crucified by the Jews. Volusian, unable to execute his commission, thought himself fortunate in obtaining a portrait of Jesus. Veronica, a pious matron, had wiped the face of the Saviour as He passed, overpowered by the weight of the cross, and the Saviour, in return, had allowed the cloth to retain the impress of His features.[1] Volusian conducted Veronica, and with her the portrait, back to Rome, bringing Pilate in chains on board the same vessel. When they arrived in the presence of the Emperor, Tiberius sentenced the ex-governor to life-long exile in the town of Ameria. The handkerchief he ordered to be brought before him, and hardly had he set eyes on it when he burst into tears, fell on his knees in adoration, and immediately recovered of his leprosy.

[1] The Jesuit Landsberg assures us that the portrait was true to life; he even discovers the print of the blow inflicted by an impious soldier on the face of Christ. Severan., p. 160. S. Veronica is, however, unfortunately a fiction, and originated from *vera icon*, or "the true portrait" of Christ, supposed to have been given to King Abgarus of Edessa. La Farina, *Storia d'Italia*, i. 210.

He heaped wealth upon Veronica, and had the handkerchief set in gold and precious stones, and preserved in his palace. He survived his recovery only nine months; an interval which he spent in constant prayer to the Saviour and in adoration of His portrait.

The celebrated legend is one of a number which bring the Pagan Emperors into connection with Christianity. Round Augustus, in whose reign the Saviour's birth took place, centres one of the most beautiful of these local myths, which we shall afterwards relate, and his terrible successor Tiberius, who occupied the throne at the time of the Crucifixion, became in like manner the subject of legend. The history of Veronica's handkerchief, which existed in its main outlines in the days of Eusebius and Tertullian, is of earlier date than the legend relating to Augustus. The date, however, when arose the legend that Tiberius, in consequence of his miraculous cure through the handkerchief, ordered Christ to be enrolled among the gods is uncertain. The Senate, it is said, refused to obey the Emperor; on the contrary, it commanded that all the Christians should be banished from the city, when Tiberius fell into a transport of rage and caused several of the Fathers to be put to death. The latter legend probably dates from the twelfth century. Bishop Orosius, however, who lived in the beginning of the fifth, and who knew nothing of the handkerchief, informs us that Tiberius, on the refusal of the Senate to enrol Christ among the gods, became suddenly transformed from an amiable prince into a cruel tyrant.[1]

[1] Orosius, *Hist.*, xii. c. 4, does not mention Veronica, but only tells

Roman tradition continues the history of the Sudarium, and asserts that Veronica remained in possession of her treasure after the Emperor's death, but that, dying herself at the age of a hundred, she bequeathed it to Bishop Clement, whose successors reverently guarded the relic until it was deposited by Boniface IV. in the Pantheon.[1] John VII. at length removed it to his chapel in S. Peter's, and there had it enclosed in a marble tabernacle.

This Pope, however, conferred a greater benefit on the Church by his restoration of a world-renowned monastery in the Campagna. The Benedictine Abbey of Subiaco, the earliest foundation of Benedict, had suffered the fate of its colony, Monte Casino. Destroyed by the Lombards in 601, and its monks transferred to S. Erasmus on the Coelian, Subiaco had remained deserted more than a hundred years before John VII. undertook the work of restoration.[2]

Subiaco restored.

us that, on receiving the news of Christ's death and resurrection, Tiberius desired to enrol Him among the gods, and was prevented by the Senate. Otto von Freising, *Chron.*, iii. c. 12, borrows from Orosius, but he too has nothing about Veronica, although the monk Benedict was acquainted with the legend two centuries earlier.

[1] A chest still stands in the Pantheon bearing the ridiculous inscription: *In ista capsa fuit portatum sudarium passionis Domini nostri Jesu Christi a Hierosolymis Tiberio Augusto.*

[2] Mabillon, *Annal. Bened.*, lib. xix. 23.

3. Sisinnius, 707—Constantinus, 708 — Punishment Inflicted on Ravenna—The Pope Journeys to the East—Executions in Rome—Revolt under George in Ravenna—First Confederation of Italian Cities—Philippicus Bardanes Emperor, 711—The Romans Refuse their Allegiance—The Roman Duke and Duchy—Civil War in Rome—The Palace of the Caesars—Anastasius II. Emperor, 713—Death of Constantine, 715.

Sisinnius, a Syrian, succeeded John in the pontificate, but reigned only twenty days.[1] Death prevented him from carrying out his praiseworthy design of restoring the walls of the city, which had fallen into a ruinous condition. Sisinnius Pope, 708.

His successor, Constantine, likewise a Syrian, a strong and active man, was ordained on March 25, 708. Events of importance characterised the seven years' reign of this Pope. In 709 Ravenna was visited by a terrible calamity, the Emperor carrying into execution his scheme of revenge against the city which he had sworn to punish. The Patricius Theodore appeared in the harbour with a fleet from Sicily, beguiled the local nobility and the principal clergy on board the vessels, and there loaded them with chains. The Greeks landed, sacked and burnt the city, and, at the same time, massacred great numbers of its inhabitants. The more important citizens, however, were led prisoners by the Patricius before Constantine Pope, 708–715. Ravenna punished by the Emperor.

[1] John VII. was buried in S. Peter's on October 18. Sisinnius was consecrated in January 708, and buried in S. Peter's on the 7th February of the same year (Jaffé).

the throne of Justinian, and sentenced to execution. Among these victims of Imperial revenge was Johannicius. Condemned to be immured alive, the celebrated Ravennese was led through the streets of Constantinople, the executioner, who walked before him, proclaiming the cruel punishment he was ordained to suffer.[1] His fellow-prisoner, the Archbishop Felix, was deprived of his sight and banished to Pontus.[2]

The dreadful fate which had overtaken Ravenna struck dismay into the Italian provinces and increased the hatred towards the Byzantines. Had but the cities been united, and had dread of the Lombards not crippled their powers, they might thus early have thrown off the Greek yoke. Even Rome bewailed the ruin of her rival; the Pope, however, turned the situation to his own advantage, for the Emperor found himself obliged to assume an attitude of

[1] *Johannicius Ravennianus ille facundus poëta, quia invictissimo Augusto contrarius fuit, inter duos fornices murina morte vita privetur.* Agnellus gives the history of this man in *Vita Theodori, Damiani, S. Felicis.* It is, however, a romance. His sister begged that the head of her brother should be shown her from the window after his execution; she saw it, wept, and died. Agnellus calls himself the great grandson of Johannicius. With regard to this memorable historian, who closes his work with Bishop George about the year 844, see the Prolegomena in Amadesi's *Antistit. Ravenn. Chronotaxis Favent.*, 1783. His wretched prose is a mixture of the naïve simplicity of the chronicler with a bombastic imitation of the style of the ancient rhetoricians. The latest edition of Agnellus is that of Holder-Egger in *Mon. Germ. Hist.* (*Script. rer. Langobardicar. et Italicar.*, saec. vi.–ix. 1878).

[2] Muratori derives the Italian *abbaccinare* from the Byzantine mode of blinding, by which the condemned was obliged to hold his eyes in a red-hot basin in which vinegar was poured.

friendliness. Justinian invited the Pope to come in person to Constantinople to settle the still-disputed points in the articles of the Trullan Synod, and the head of the Roman Church, terrified by the punishment which had befallen Ravenna, yielded obedience to the Imperial command. Sighing, he embarked from Portus on October 5, 710, accompanied by the chief dignitaries of the Church, Bishop Nicetas of Silva Candida, George of Portus, and several cardinals and officials of the papal palace. It is worth our while to follow the Pope on his journey, and trace the route then taken from Rome to Constantinople. It led from Naples to Sicily, thence to Rhegium, Crotona, and Gallipolis. The winter was spent in Hydruntum: in spring the journey continued along the coast of Greece, thence to the Isle of Caea, and on to Constantinople. The authorities had everywhere been instructed to accord a courteous reception to the Roman bishop. Outside the capital, Tiberius, son of the Emperor, at the head of the Senate, and Cyrus the Patriarch, at the head of the clergy, awaited his arrival, and the last Pope ever seen in Constantinople made his entry on horseback, the mitre on his head, and took up his abode in the Palace of Placidia.[1]

The Pope summoned to Byzantium.

The Emperor was at the time at Nicea in Bithynia. Constantine was therefore obliged to leave the capital, and repair to meet him at Nicomedia. The cruel Rhinotmetus, dripping with the blood of his

[1] The *Lib. Pont.* speaks of the mitre as *camelaucum* (Greek, *καμελαύκιον*); the Italians call it *camauro*. See Vignoli's note on this passage.

enemies, became purified in the eyes of man by the papal embrace, by confession, and communion; but of the matters discussed during the interview nothing is recorded.[1] It would appear that Emperor and Pope came to an understanding, since the astute Constantine returned from the East in the autumn of 711, fortified with the ratification of all the privileges of the Roman Church. Arrived at Cajeta, he found several of the Roman clergy and nobles, who had hastened thither to greet him. They led him back rejoicing, and, after a year's absence, he re-entered the city, October 24.

He was now informed of the dreadful occurrences which had taken place during his absence. Immediately on his departure, the Exarch, John Rizocopus, had come to Rome, had here seized some of the chief ecclesiastical officials, and had them executed without a trial. The motive of this action remains unknown, but as the Exarch left for Ravenna, where he died, immediately after the execution, it would seem that it must in some way have been associated with the rebellion of the Ravennese.

The unfortunate city had risen in despair and thrown off the yoke of Byzantium. It was the capital of the rich province of Romagna, and the seat of a powerful metropolitan. The Roman Empire, like the Gothic Monarchy, lay buried within its walls. It was the residence of the Byzantine viceroy; was, next

[1] *Lib. Pont.*; who can believe, however, that the Emperor, the crown on his head, prostrated himself and kissed the feet of the Pope? It is added that, *pro delictis suis*, he confessed, and received the communion.

to Rome, the greatest city of the time in Italy, and far outstripped Rome in wealth, which it owed to its commercial relations with the East. Roman laws still survived in the Romagna, which had remained unconquered by the Lombards, a fact which contributed to the revival of the Latin national sentiment, both in Ravenna and the other cities of the Exarchate. An unconquerable independence has, in all ages, characterised the hot-blooded Romagnoli, and the inhabitants of Ravenna were a people of passionate instincts and fanatical customs, as the accounts of their chronicler, Agnellus, testify. Every Sunday, he informs us, nobles and people, men and women, were accustomed to contest with each other outside the city gates. They were divided into two parties, those from the Porta Tiguriensis, and those from the Posterula, or from the *Summus vicus*. They fought with slings, the children played with quoits.[1] Out of these popular games struggles for life and death arose. One Sunday, as the vanquished party from the Posterula left their dead and wounded covering the field, they planned a diabolical revenge. Under cover of a solemn reconciliation, they amicably invited the Tigurians to the Basilica Ursiana. Each man took a guest home with him, here stabbed him, and secretly made away with the corpse. No one knew what had become of the missing citizens. Baths, public resorts, and shops were closed; widows and orphans filled the streets with lamentations. A week

[1] An ancient game with quoits, now known as *ruzzola*. The text says: *parvuli cum modica orbitella*. Agnellus, *Vita Damasi*, c. ii. 327.

passed away. Bishop Damian ordered the whole population in sackcloth and ashes to join in procession,[1] when, as the Ravennese historian relates, the earth opened, and the dead were disclosed to sight. The assassins were executed; even their wives and children had to suffer the popular revenge. The quarter Posterula was destroyed, and henceforth the district was known by the opprobrious name of the "Brigand's quarter."

These events took place at the end of the seventh century, and we have quoted them here merely as an example of the height to which, even at this period, party feeling, the peculiar characteristic of the Middle Ages in Italy, had already been developed.

Insurrection in Ravenna.

Ravenna rose in insurrection in 710 or 711. George, the brave son of that John who had been executed, was elected leader of the insurgent city, the "Capitano del Popolo," as we may already call him, in the language of the Middle Ages. He divided Ravenna into twelve companies or bands, according to the divisional banners of the city militia: Ravenna, Band 1, Band 2, New Banner, Unconquered Banner, Constantinopolitan, Firm, Merry, Milanese, Veronese Banner, Banner of Classe, and the Division of the

[1] *Saccos induti sunt—ciliciis se operierunt*—the cowls of the confraternities. Those who wore them of haircloth (*ciliccino*) were called especially *i sacconi*. Agnellus, who wrote only a hundred years later, mentions the ornaments then customarily worn by women: *mutatorias vestes, pallia, inaures, anulos, dextralia* (bracelets), *pereselidas* (?) [*i.e.*, *periscelidas*, anklets—Transl.], *monilia* (necklets), *olfactoria* (scent-bottles) *et acus, et specula, et lunulas* (lunate ornaments of gold), *et liliola* (ornaments formed like a lily), *praesidia* (?) *et laudosias* (?). Ravenna still possessed theatres and baths.

Archbishop, with the Clergy and Servants of the Church. These military divisions continued to exist in the ninth century, and doubtless corresponded to a like arrangement in Rome, where it must have arisen in accordance with the Regions of the city.[1] George succeeded in forming the first federation of the cities of which we have any knowledge: Sarxena (Sarsina), Cervia, Cesena, Forum Pompilii (Forlimpopoli), Forum Livii (Forlì), Faventia (Faenza), Forum Cornelii (Imola), and Bononia (Bologna), almost the entire territory of the Exarchate joined in league with Ravenna. This memorable confederation, the first confederation of Latin cities, formed long before Milan or Florence had attained power or renown, ushers in the Middle Ages in Italy. It constitutes the first step towards the communal independence of the Republics. Unfortunately, contemporary documents here fail us; the mutilated history of Agnellus giving no further information of the confederation and its wars against the Greeks. Even the

[1] In the Imperial administration of Byzantium, *bandus* or *vexillum*, the significance of which is variable, was also a military subdivision of the Thema. Rambaud, *l'Empire grec au X^me siecle*, 1870, p. 194. Agnellus makes use of *bandus*, *militia*, *numerus* synonymously. *Numerus* for regiment belongs to Imperial times; the term is even found in an inscription of Damasus to denote the company (*exercitus*) of martyrs. Some of these companies existed under the Exarchs. The *Papiri Dipl.* of Marini adduce: *Numerus felicum Theodosiacus* (n. 90); *Num. Mil. Sermisiana*, probably Dacians from Zarmisia (n. 91); *Num. Victricis Mediolan.* (n. 93); *Num. Arminiorum* (n. 95); *Num. felicum Persoarminiorum* (n. 122); *Num. Veronensium* (n. 95); *Num. Juniorum* and *Num. Invicti* (n. 111). The names were derived from places, Emperors, or from abstract ideas. The officers were called Tribunus, Primicerius, Adorator (an unexplained word), and Optio or Ozio, explained as the *distributor annonae milit.*

year of the rebellion, which is the close of an entire period, is uncertain. The Ravennese may perhaps have risen on the news of the death of the Emperor, which happened, as the *Liber Pontificalis* informs us, three months after the Pope's return to Rome. Philippicus Bardanes had seized the throne of Byzantium towards the end of the year 711, and had sent the head of the tyrant Justinian to the West, to gladden Roman eyes.[1] The people probably crowded round the lifeless head with the same dull curiosity as they had previously evinced on the arrival of the same Emperor's laurel-crowned statue. Thus, in these dark ages, the head of a dead Caesar made its Imperial progress through the provinces he had so grievously oppressed, while the axe had probably been already whetted for the neck of his murderer and successor.

The suppression of the revolution in Ravenna is veiled in darkness, and we know nothing more than that the insurrection was crushed by the Byzantines, apparently under Philippicus, and that the cities of the Exarchate were again rendered subject to the Emperor. Bardanes, a heretic and Monothelite, had scarcely assumed the purple when he annulled the decrees of the Sixth Council, and caused the picture which represented it to be removed from the wall of the Imperial Palace. Dogmatic theology was in this age esteemed of such vital importance, and so deeply penetrated all relations of life, that each Emperor on his succession was expected to send his Sacra, or

[1] ὁ δὲ Φιλιππικὸς διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ σπαθαρίου ταύτην ἐπὶ τὰ δυτικὰ μέρη ἕως Ῥώμης ἐξέπεμψεν : Theoph., *Chronogr.*, p. 319.

profession of faith, to the chief bishops of the Empire. Bardanes sent his to Rome, where it was, however, rejected as heretical by the Pope and clergy. A large picture, illustrating the Sixth Oecumenical Council, was painted on the walls of S. Peter's. This significant manner of embodying a political protest was again resorted to in Rome under other conditions in the later Middle Ages.[1] The entire people were now in open revolt against an Emperor who had dared to deny the dual wills or natures in Christ. They again appeared as the Populus Romanus, and decided to refuse recognition to the Emperor. They determined to accept neither his portrait nor his rescripts, and resolved to exclude alike the coins bearing his effigy from their currency, and his name from their prayers.[2] Theological excitement imparted a new character to the city. The people, who had hitherto only come forward on the occasion of a papal election, now appeared in the light of citizens, and took their part in political affairs. The nobility, the army, and the citizens, divided into their guilds, unanimously agreed to resist the head of the Empire. Even the *Liber Pontificalis* on this occasion makes use, for the first time, of the expression "Duchy of the Roman city," and by these words the entire district right and left of the Tiber, Roman Tuscany and the Campagna

The Romans refuse obedience to the Emperor.

Ducatus Romanus.

[1] The Greeks called these pictures *pancarea*. *Lib. Pont.*, "Vita Const.," n. 174.

[2] *Lib. Pont.*: *Hisdem temporib. cum statuisset populus Romanus nequaquam haeretici Imperatoris nomen, aut chartas, vel figuram solidi suscipere.*

may be understood. For the first time, in connection with this Duchy, the Duke who administered it is also mentioned.[1]

This was Christophorus, who had been appointed Dux of Rome during the previous reign, but who was now deprived of his authority by the Emperor or Exarch, and, in order to favour the new government, Peter of Ravenna was sent to Rome. The majority of the people, however, refused to accept the nominee of the heretical Emperor. The city again divided into two factions, one, under the name of "Christians," took part with Christophorus; the minority, under the leadership of Agathon, espoused the cause of Peter. In the obscurity of these times we follow the course of this tumult, dignified by the *Liber Pontificalis* with the high-sounding name of civil war (*bellum civile*), with suspense, as an important event which ushers in a new era, and, at the same time, revives recollections of already forgotten antiquity. The rival factions came into collision on the Via Sacra, opposite the Palace of the Caesars, and the ancient pavement was stained with the blood of the slain. It thus follows that both the Via Sacra and the Palatium still existed in the beginning of the eighth century, and, judging from the particular site at which the struggle took place, we may justly conclude that the palace was inhabited by the Dux himself. The adherents of

Civil war in Rome.

[1] The passage runs: *contigit, ut Petrus quidam pro ducatu Romanae urbis Ravennam dirigeretur, et praeceptum pro hujusmodi causa acciperet*, n. 176. It is singular that the Duces of Rome never come to sight until a time when their power was on the wane.

Peter, the more effectually to expel Duke Christophorus, doubtless attacked him in the government buildings.[1] The palace of the Caesars had undergone a restoration only a few years before, and, at the end of the seventh century, a *Cura Palatii Urbis Romae*, or official set apart to take charge of the palace, had been appointed. The office, so highly esteemed by Cassiodorus, had been filled by Plato, father of John VII.; and two inscriptions of the years 686 and 688, referring to Plato and his wife Blatta, were erected by their son, then Rector of the Patrimonium Appiae in the church of S. Anastasia. The first of these tablets informs us that Plato, as overseer of the ancient palace, having restored its great staircase, entered into the heavenly palace of the Eternal King.[2] The dwelling of so many Emperors, the centre of the history of the universe, whence through so long a course of centuries mankind had been wisely governed or disgracefully oppressed, now sank into total oblivion, so that, as early as the days of Charles the Great, the forsaken

Palace of the Caesars.

[1] In *Via Sacra ante palatium.*

[2] *Ultima funereo persolvens munia busto*
*Quo pater illustris membra locanda dedit*
*Adjecit titulos proles veneranda Joannes*
*Ne tantis quovis esset honore minor.*
*Hic jacet ille Plato, qui multa per agmina lustrans*
*Et maris undisoni per freta longa volans*
*Claruit insignis regno gratusque minister*
*Celebremque sua praestitit esse manu.*
*Post ergo multiplices quas prisca Palatia Romae*
*Praestiterant curas longo refecta gradu*
*Pergit ad aeterni divini palatia regis*
*Sumere cum meritis praemia firma dei.*

halls of Augustus, Tiberius, and Domitian had become the haunt of owls, and monks planted the olive in the dust of vanished splendour, even as they do to-day.

A procession of priests, bearing crucifixes and the gospels, parted the combatants. Papal policy astutely upheld the principle of neutrality in all party strife, and the Pope now effected a peace. Although the faction of the "Christians" could easily have vanquished their opponents, the Pope commanded them to withdraw, and a truce was thus silently concluded, until news arrived from Sicily a few days after that Bardanes had been dethroned and deprived of sight.

Anastasius II., a private secretary in the palace, had brought this revolution to a successful issue, and had caused himself to be proclaimed Emperor on June 4, 713. It therefore follows that the disturbances in Rome must have lasted nearly a year and a half. They were now subdued, and the new Emperor after a time sent the Patricius Scholasticus

*Plato v. Ill. Cura Palatii Urbis Romae Vix. An. Pl. M. LXVI. Dep. M. Nob. Die. VII. Indict. XV. Imp. DN. Justiniano Aug. Anno II. P.C. Ejus Anno. II.* (Marini, *Pap. Dipl.*, p. 667, n. 1 to n. 134.)

In the *Epitome Chronicor. Cassinens.* (Muratori, ii. p. i. 354) we are told that Heraclius, after having captured the Cross, came to the Aurea Urbs and was there crowned in the Palace of the Caesars. I am astonished that Nibby on Nardini, iii. 180, and Visconti, *Città e famiglie*, sec. ii. 255, can believe this. I am further surprised to find the fable accepted by C. L. Visconti and Lanciani in the *Guida del Palatino*, p. 55, 1873. The same chronicler (who can scarcely have written, however, before the year 1000) relates the same fable of the Emperor Maurice.

as Exarch to Italy, entrusting him with his orthodox profession of faith for the Roman bishop. Peter, after assuring the Romans of a complete amnesty, obtained recognition as Dux.[1] Reconciliation with the Emperor.

At this point the *Liber Pontificalis* closes the life of Constantine. He died on April 8, 715,—a worthy predecessor of the greater Popes under whom Rome effected her emancipation from the yoke of Byzantium.

[1] From the active part taken by the people in the election of the Dux, Bethmann-Hollweg (*Ursprung der Lombard. Städtefreiheit*, p. 186) justly assumes that this Dux was head of the city and of the entire duchy. It cannot be doubted that the Dux, as Viceroy of the Emperor, was rector of the Rome of his time.

# BOOK FOURTH.

FROM THE PONTIFICATE OF GREGORY II. (715)
TO THE CORONATION OF CHARLES
AS EMPEROR (800).

# CHAPTER I.

1. Pontificate of Gregory II., 715—His Activity—Conversion of Germany by Boniface—Leo the Isaurian—Image-worship—The Bronze Statue of S. Peter in the Vatican.

After seven Popes of Greek or Syrian descent, a Roman again filled the papal throne in the person of Gregory II., the successor of Constantine I. The ancient Roman name, Marcellus, borne by his father, leads us to suppose that the new Pope may have been descended from some illustrious patrician house. The Romans had elected a fellow-countryman evidently in opposition to Byzantium, and had thus taken an important and momentous step. While deacon, Gregory had accompanied his predecessor to the Imperial court, and on the deliberations on the articles of the Trullan Council had acquired the reputation of an eloquent and determined man. He was elected to the Papacy on May 19, 715, in the third year of the reign of the Emperor Anastasius. Gregory II., 715–731.

The Lombards were at this time governed by Liutprand, son of Ansprand, a prince of lofty ambitions. He refused to confirm the donation of Aribert II., and, although the Pope strove to avoid

a rupture, and the Nuncio succeeded in preventing one, Gregory nevertheless deemed it necessary to restore the tottering walls of Aurelian, which were the bulwark of Roman independence. Workmen were already engaged in repairing the walls beside the Gate of S. Lorenzo, when an unexpected hindrance, in the form of a sudden rise of the Tiber,[1] prevented the fulfilment of the design. The river overflowed the lower part of the city and caused great destruction in the Campus Martius.[2]

Such are the sole events concerning the city itself recorded during the early years of Gregory's reign, the dearth of contemporary documents leaving us in ignorance even of the Pope's energetic career. His authority extended into Southern Italy, where, however, about 717, the Lombards of Benevento had succeeded in acquiring the strong Greek fortress of Cumae. He instructed John, the Neapolitan Dux, as to his course of action,[3] and when the Greek Dux again wrested the fortress from the Lombards, he was rewarded by the Pope with seventy pounds in gold from the ecclesiastical treasury. As the first Gregory had conquered distant provinces for the Church, so the second, while equally victorious, was still more fortunate. The English, converted by the

[1] *Lib. Pont.* in Gregorio II., n. 177.

[2] *Lib. Pont.*, n. 180; Paul. Diacon., *de Gest. Lang.*, vi. 36, and Bede, *de sex aetat. ad Ann.* 4671. Pagi and Muratori place the inundation in the year 716, Baronius in 717, and so, too, the "Index Ducum Spoletan. et Abbat. Farfensium" in Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.*, i. 2, 63.

[3] *Ducatum ei qualiter agerent quotidie scribendo praestabat. Lib. Pont.*, n. 181.

earlier Pope, now in turn became the missionaries of Germany. Gregory II., having invested the celebrated Winfried or Boniface with the dignity of a German bishop, sent him as Apostolic legate to those still uncivilised and forest-covered lands, and here this devoted servant of the Papacy established the dominion of the Roman Church. Thus, after long centuries of obscurity, the vigorous warrior races of Germany were again brought into immediate communion with Rome, and the ties now formed were destined to exercise a powerful influence not only on the fate of the Church, but on that also of the entire West.

Boniface, Apostle of the Germans.

The period was in the full throes of a new development. When, in the seventh century, the ruin of the ancient world was at length complete, out of the universal chaos a new continent had arisen, and this territory the Roman Church had taken within her keeping. While uniting the German races in England, Gaul, Spain and Italy with the Latins in one common spiritual order, the Church created an international federation in the West, and this federation in the course of time again assumed the form of the Roman Empire. This united Empire of Germans and Latins was, however, already threatened with dangers. In the fulness of youthful vigour, the Arabic East rose in arms, the Mohammedans attacked Constantinople, the Saracens ruled in the Mediterranean, menaced Italy and Rome, and, advancing from Spain, which they had already subjugated, to the southern provinces of Gaul, threatened the kingdom of the Franks, and with it

the bulwark of the Roman Church in the West. Precisely at this time an event took place which was to give a new form alike to Rome and Italy.

Leo the Isaurian.

After two military revolutions, which had overthrown the Emperors Anastasius and Theodosius respectively, Leo III., the Isaurian, had succeeded to the throne on March 25, 717. This energetic man had defeated the Arabs before the walls of Constantinople, and had infused a new life into the Byzantine Empire. The glory of his warlike deeds faded during his lifetime, but the bitter contest with reference to the use or misuse of images in churches, which he evoked by an edict, has rendered his name immortal. The simple soldier spirit of the Emperor had fallen a victim to the passion for theological questions common to the Byzantines, and it had been represented to him that the worship of images in the churches was the sole hindrance to the conversion of the Jews and Mohammedans.[1] Leo III. began the memorable attempt, revived by his successors more than a hundred years later—a reformation of the Greek Church. He conceived the ambitious idea of purifying the Christian religion from the worship of images, but this herculean task could not, unfortunately, be accomplished by decrees and councils. The loud cries of derision on the part of the Mohammedans, who gave vent to their scorn of the lifeless images in the vanquished cities of Syria, and the malicious speeches of the Jews at

Worship of images.

[1] Leo's advisers were Bishop Theophilus of Nacolia in Phrygia, and Beser, a convert from Judaism. Schlosser, *Gesch. der bilderstürmenden Kaiser*, 1812, p. 161.

the Imperial court, filled the Emperor with shame. The unbelievers asserted that the Christians, while pretending to adore the true God, had filled the world with more gods than they had overthrown in the Pagan temples since the time of Constantine, and that the professors of the evangelical faith unhesitatingly worshipped objects of metal, stone, and wood, faces painted on cloths, and the hideous likenesses of innumerable miracle-workers. The Roman world, they maintained, had returned to its earlier Paganism, and Christianity had degenerated into idol-worship, while the spirit of the true and only God, and the law of the Prophet were the sole ornaments of their mosques and synagogues.

There were Greek bishops also, more especially in Asia Minor, who disapproved of the abuses of image-worship, and contrasted the faith of the early centuries of Christianity, when such worship was unknown, with the degenerate religion of their own times. In former days the Pagans had taunted the Christians that the latter, in the poverty of their plebeian religion, possessed neither temples, altars, nor beautiful statues, and the Christians had retorted with the enquiry, "Do you believe that we conceal the object of our worship because we have neither temples nor altars? What does an image of God signify to us, when man himself is made in the likeness of God? Wherefore should I build a temple when I cannot even comprehend the universe which is the work of His hands? and when I, a man, have such a spacious dwelling-place, wherefore should I confine the Almighty in a narrow cell? Is it not

wiser to consecrate our souls and hearts a dwelling-place for God?"[1] The times of Minucius Felix were now past, and unbelievers were able to retort in contemptuous scorn. The Synod of Illiberis, in the beginning of the fourth century, had prohibited the use of images in the churches as a source of danger. In the sixth century, however, the promulgation of a similar decree had already become impossible.[2]

It is unnecessary to add that, in the beginning of the eighth century, every country in Christendom was filled with pictures and images of Christ, the Virgin, and the saints. Until the fifth, the worship of such pictures and images had remained optional, the representation of the cross itself not having received general acceptance until long after the days of Constantine.[3] But, from the early part of

[1] *Quod enim simulacrum Deo fingam, cum si recte aestimes, sit Dei homo ipse simulacrum? . . . Nonne melius in nostra ima dedicandus est mente, in nostro imo consecrandus est pectore?* A beautiful passage in the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix. Paris edition, 1605, p. 367.

[2] *Concil. Illiberis*, Can. 36: *Placuit picturas esse in ecclesia non debere, ne quod colitur et adoratur in parietibus depingatur.*

[3] The custom of representing Christ naked on the cross was unknown in the early centuries of Christianity. Even the celebrated Graffito, a Pagan caricature of the Crucifixion, found on the Palatine in 1856, represents the Crucified as clothed. F. X. Kraus, *Das Spottcrucifix vom Palatin*, Freiburg, 1872. There is no instance of a crucifix being discovered in any of the oldest churchyards of Rome. The ancient crucifix of Lucca represents the Saviour as clad in a decent tunic, and diademed. The Byzantine oil-vases in Monza, moreover, presented to Queen Theodolinda, which depict the Saviour's passion, represent the two thieves hanging on their crosses, while Christ is raised in glory above His cross. The use of the crucifix was still very rare in the time of Gregory I.

the eighth century onwards, the imagination of the East was utterly degraded in the constant production of representations of the saints. Miraculous likenesses, portraits of Christ as Saviour, and of the Virgin, "not made with hands" (ἀχειροποίητος), but mystic impressions from the original, or works of angels or the Apostle Luke, suddenly appeared in European and Asiatic cities, and drew crowds of pilgrims to such churches as could boast the possession of these lucrative portraits.

The West had followed the example of the East; and as early as the sixth century churches had been adorned with pictures as well as statues of saints. Among these paintings, however, we must distinguish the likenesses of Christ and the saints, depicted at an early date in the catacombs, and on the tribunes and triumphal arches in the basilicas. The histories of the martyrs had hitherto been avoided in the Roman church, so that, in such as have already come under our notice, the tortures inflicted on the early followers of Christianity have not in any single instance found representation. This class of subjects was reserved for a later age, when a waning faith seemed to demand the aid of such gruesome stimulants.[1] Neither the paintings

[1] Prudentius (*Hymnus ix.* to S. Cassian) saw a painting representing the schoolmaster-saint being tortured to death with styluses by his pupils, in the sepulchral church at Forum Cornelii. This, so far as I am aware, is the earliest mention of a picture of this description. In the beginning of the fifth century Paulinus of Nola had the church which he dedicated to S. Felix painted with the histories of the martyrs. In the sixth century pictures of this nature came into general use in the churches.

in the catacombs, nor the sculptures on the ancient Christian sarcophagi, reveal a single representation of the Passion of our Lord. They depict, instead, Christ in the act of teaching His disciples or performing His miracles. The possession of the bodies of the highest rank of the sainted dead, on which Rome congratulated herself, may have long prevented, or at least checked, the adoration of wonder-working images, but when Edessa and Paneas, Jerusalem, and other Asiatic cities began to boast the presence of genuine portraits of Christ, Rome could not remain in the background, and it is not improbable that the Handkerchief of Veronica may have been publicly exhibited as early as the seventh century.[1] In the time of Gregory I., Rome herself laid claim to genuine portraits of Christ, the Virgin, and the two Princes of the Apostles; and the Pope, in sending copies of these portraits to Bishop Secundinus, took occasion to inform him that the pictures were not intended to serve as objects of adoration, but merely as memorials. Enlightened bishops of Gaul regarded the idolatrous practices with displeasure, fearing, with good reason, that, in the mind of the superstitious multitude, Christianity would again degenerate into idol-worship. When Serenus of Marseilles had resolved to destroy some

[1] The earliest portraits of Christ probably belong to the third century, and are of Gnostic origin. Augustine knew of no genuine likeness. *Qua fuerit ille facie nos penitus ignoramus—nam et ipsius Dominicae facies carnis innumerabilium cogitationum diversitate variatur et fingitur; quae tamen una erat, quaecumque erat. De Trinit.*, viii. c. 4, 5, oper. iii. Alex. Severus is said to have placed the effigy of Christ in his Lararium (Lamprid., c. 29).

pictures in one of the churches of his diocese, Gregory wrote in remonstrance: "Thy zeal to prevent the adoration of man's handiwork redounds to thy honour, but, in my opinion, thou doest wrong in destroying these pictures, since the Church has made use of painting in order that such as are unable to read may be instructed by the pictures on the walls in matters which they could not otherwise understand."[1] The views to which Gregory here gives utterance with regard to the use of pictures were eagerly quoted by all such later Popes as took up arms in defence of the question. The multitude did not, however, share these moderate opinions; on the contrary, their irrational devotion assumed the character of direct worship. The manufactory of likenesses of saints gave occupation to countless artists and monks, and the churches which boasted the possession of these miraculous effigies drew considerable revenues from the fact. Pictures were more numerous than statues; the art of sculpture, partly on account of the horror with which statues had been regarded by the early Christians, partly from other causes, having made less progress than painting. If, in the beginning of the eighth century, figures carved in wood were not yet carried in procession in Rome, numbers of gold, silver, and bronze statues of the Saviour, the

[1] *Et quidem zelum vos, ne quid manufactum adorari possit, habuisse laudavimus, sed frangere easdem imagines non debuisse judicamus. Idcirco enim pictura in ecclesiis adhibetur, ut hi qui litteras nesciunt saltem in parietibus videndo legant, quae legere in codicibus non valent.* S. Greg., Ep. 110, vii. Ind. 2. So, too, in the letter to Serenus, Ep. 9, ix., and to Secundinus, Ep. 54, vii. Ind. 2.

Virgin, and the Apostles existed in the churches. Probably as early as the fifth century, the celebrated bronze statue of S. Peter had been placed in the atrium of his basilica; and the Apostle thus early had offered his foot to the kisses of the faithful, even as in former times the renowned bronze Hercules in the temple at Agrigentum had presented his face to be saluted by his devoted worshippers. With regard to the latter statue, we are informed by Cicero that the chin had been worn smooth by the fervent kisses bestowed upon it.[1]

The bronze statue of S. Peter in the Vatican.

In dealing with the times of Leo I., we have already spoken of the statue of the Apostle, and now again revert to it, owing to the fact that the figure had become a cause of special offence in the eyes of the iconoclastic Emperor, while Pope Gregory II., on the other hand, describes it as the object of the most jealous love of his fellow-citizens. The bronze statue, which at this time stood in the monastery of S. Martin near the Vatican Basilica, was honoured by the Christians of Rome as the Palladium of their city, and evoked from them the same reverence that the statue of Victory had evoked from their Pagan ancestors. It represents the Apostle seated, his right hand raised in benediction, his left grasping

[1] Cicero in *Verrem*, iv. c. 44, § 94. *Herculis templum est apud Agrigentinos. Ibi est ex aere simulacrum Herculis, quo non facile dixerim quidquam me vidisse pulchrius—usque eo, judices—ut rictum ejus ac mentum paulo sit attritius, quod in precibus et gratulationibus non solum id venerari, verum etiam osculari solent.* The foot of the bronze Peter in the Vatican has been worn entirely smooth by the kisses of the multitude; the long kiss of time proving as destructive to monuments as its gnawing tooth.

the keys, and is of ancient but unknown origin ; its outlines are bold, and its draperies good. Whether the assertion that it had been formed out of the molten bronze of the image of the Capitoline Jupiter be tenable, or whether it be more than probable that the figure is merely that of some consul or early Emperor, it is at least certain that the style is not Byzantine, but as ancient and pure as that of the sculptures on the best Christian sarcophagi, or that of the marble statue, S. Hippolytus, at present standing in the Lateran Museum.

The mode in which it became customary to represent the Prince of the Apostles, namely, with short, woolly hair and round cropped beard, in contrast to S. Paul, to whom smooth hair and a long beard were assigned, was probably not first created, though it may well have been fixed, by this famous figure in the Vatican.[1]

## 2. LEO'S EDICT AGAINST IMAGE-WORSHIP—RESISTANCE IN ROME AND ITALY—PLOT AGAINST GREGORY'S LIFE—THE ROMANS AND LOMBARDS RISE IN ARMS—REVOLT AGAINST BYZANTIUM—GREGORY'S LETTERS TO THE EMPEROR.

In 726 the Emperor issued his celebrated edict, ordering all pictures to be removed from the churches

Leo prohibits the worship of images, 726.

[1] Another similar ancient statue of S. Peter, but of marble, which formerly stood over the main door of the basilica, is now in the crypt. Torrigius, *Le sacre grotte*, p. 73. Both Cancellieri (*de Sacrariis novae Basil. Vatic.*, p. 1503, f.) and Cardinal Domenico Bartolini (*Della celebratissima Statua di Bronzo del Principe degli Apostoli S. Pietro, che si venera nelle sua Vaticana basilica*, Rome, 1850) have written on the subject of the celebrated statue. Bartolini holds it to

throughout the Empire.[1] A storm of resistance followed, both in the East and West. The populace rose in fanatical revolt, and the innumerable company of priests were forced to recognise that their power rested mainly on the material apparatus of the faith. Countless statues were destroyed, not only in the East, but also in some provinces of the West, while Jews and Mohammedans regarded with malicious satisfaction the progress of destruction. The Pope, however, defended the mythology of the Christian faith even more zealously than Symmachus had been able to defend the ancient gods or the altar of Victory. Leo sent his edict to Rome, when Gregory in a Bull explained that it did not lie within the province of the Emperor either to dictate in matters of faith or to reverse the sentences of the Church. Leo, in his turn, issued fresh orders, threatening to depose the Pope if he did not obey. Gregory called upon the cities and bishops of Italy to oppose the heretical tendencies of the Emperor, and, as the *Liber Pontificalis* informs us, took up arms as against an enemy. The effects of his pastoral letters were universal. The entire Pentapolis and the Venetian forces flew to arms, and declared themselves ready to defend the Pope. Gregory saw that the national spirit was aflame, and a sign from him would have sufficed to kindle a revolution. Reasons of weight, however, induced him to avoid an open breach with

Resistance on the part of Gregory.

belong to the time of the Emperor Philip, and believes it a portrait of the Apostle.

[1] *Imago cujuslibet Sancti aut Martyris, aut Angeli. Lib. Pont.*, n. 184. Paul. Diacon., vi. c. 49, and Theophan., *Chronogr.*, p. 338.

the Empire, and a fresh imposition of taxes seems to have been the only movement on the part of Byzantium that he actually opposed.[1]

Italy rises against the Emperor.

Rome and the provinces as far as Calabria rose in rebellion, and the Pope appeared as the centre of the movement, its protector and representative, against the Emperor. On receiving the news of the rising, Leo equipped a fleet, but before it set sail for the mouth of the Tiber, a plan had been formed of disposing of Gregory in true Byzantine fashion. The Dux Basil, the Chartular Jordan, and the Subdeacon Lurion, in conjunction with Marinus, whom the Emperor had just sent as Dux to Rome, formed a plot to murder the Pope, but the sudden removal of Marinus averted the fulfilment of the design. Jordan and John were put to death by the populace; Basil sought refuge in a convent. The new Exarch Paul entered Ravenna with strict orders to suppress the insurrection among the Romans at any cost whatever. He sent an army against Rome; but the Lombards of Spoleto and Tuscany, doubtless summoned by the Pope to rise in his defence, and only too ready to weaken the Imperial power, occupied the frontiers of the Roman Duchy, and with the Romans barred the passage of the Salarian Bridge. The Greeks turned back; and the Exarch, already excommunicated by the Pope, found himself in danger even in Ravenna. The Pentapolis openly renounced obedience; the cities of Central Italy

[1] Καὶ μαθὼν τοῦτο Γρηγόριος ὁ πάππας Ῥώμης τοὺς φόρους τῆς Ἰταλίας καὶ Ῥώμης ἐκώλυσεν. Theophan. The *Lib. Pont.* merely says: *censum in provincia poni praepediebat.*

expelled the Byzantine officials, elected their own duces, and threatened to place a new Emperor on the Greek throne.[1] This memorable scheme shows that the indignant Italians never contemplated a restoration of a Roman Empire in the West, or any partition of the Empire. Gregory himself opposed the scheme, not so much that he hoped for the conversion of the Emperor, as because he feared that a convulsion so violent would betray Italy and Rome into the power of the Lombard King. Expediency already prescribed the policy of keeping the seat of government at a distance, rather than allowing a monarchy to be established in Italy. The Emperor in Constantinople was less dangerous than would have been a king, who, uniting Italy under his sceptre, would necessarily have required Rome as his capital.

The Pope prevents the Italians from revolting against the Empire.

The Pope was, moreover, obliged to avoid everything that would cause him to appear in the light of a rebel against the legitimate authority of the Empire. With prudent moderation he checked the Italians, and warned them to avoid any breach with the Emperor.[2] For this reason, although allowing the

[1] *Omnis Italia consilium iniit, ut sibi eligerent Imperatorem, et Constantinopolim ducerent. Lib. Pont.*, n. 184.

[2] The account of Theophan., p. 343, whose authority is followed by Zonaras and Cedrenus, that the Pope had stirred up Rome and the Italians to revolt, is erroneous. I am persuaded of the entire justice of all that Döllinger, *Papstfabeln des Mittelalters* (Gregory II. and Leo the Isaurian), has said on the subject. In his letters to Leo, Gregory never once conceived that the Italians proposed to elect another Emperor. The *Vita Gregorii II.* says that he exhorted the Romans: *ne desisterent ab amore, vel fide Romani imperii.* La Farina, *Storia d'Italia*, i. 215, observes with quite modern patriotism: *non oprò da pastore nè da amico d'Italia.*

populace not only to besiege Peter, the Imperial Dux, in the Palace of the Caesars, but finally either to expel or slay him, Gregory had previously endured his presence in the city.[1] The Romans, following the example of other Italian cities, may perhaps on this occasion have elected a Dux of their own, but it cannot be shown that Rome formally declared a Republic, appointing the Pope as its temporal head. A step such as this would have been in direct variance with Gregory's whole policy.[2] Meanwhile, Exhilaratus, the Dux of Naples, who had entered the Campagna with an army, had been defeated and killed by the Roman militia. The Byzantine power soon found itself restricted to Naples, the population of which, being chiefly Jews, Greeks, and Orientals engaged in commerce, would have seriously suffered by any breach with the East. From here Eutychius, the former Exarch, vainly strove to bring about a counter-revolution in Rome. His agent was seized, and owed his life solely to the intervention of the Pope, whose prudent attitude on this occasion again proves him an accomplished statesman. The indignant Emperor now seized the ecclesiastical revenues in Southern Italy, as the only, but very insufficient, means of revenging himself on the Pope. In Rome Imperial influence was completely at an end; the Byzantine party had

[1] *Petrum ducem turbaverunt* or *orbaverunt*.

[2] Such is the very modern-sounding assertion (after Pagi) of Sugenheim, *Geschichte der Entstehung und Ausbilding des Kirchenstaats*. It is difficult to produce any historic authority for this theory.

almost ceased to exist, and Gregory II., although only Bishop of the city, might regard himself as its actual head. The revolution against the Imperial officials had produced a new order of things, and called into being a civic government, at the head of which stood the *Judices de Militia.* Rome again appears as a city independent of Byzantium, under republican aristocratic forms ; forms, however, which are unknown to us. The city may probably have been governed by magistrates under the name of consuls or duces, over whom the Pope silently exercised authority. The Romans, who refused any longer to be ruled by Greek satraps, still recognised the Imperial sway. Placing themselves, however, under the protection of their powerful bishop, they unanimously supported him against the Emperor. The bishop was the natural head of Roman nationality, and thus, during the Iconoclastic controversy in Rome and throughout the Duchy, arose the temporal power of the Pope. Veiled in its beginnings, this power in the course of time assumed an historic form.

Letters of Gregory to the Emperor.

The controversy on its dogmatic side was meanwhile furiously waged by means of the pen. We possess two letters of the Pope to the Emperor Leo, written while the revolution in Rome was at its height. Their language is barbarous; their tone coarse and passionate ; never could such letters have been penned by the highly cultured Gregory I. These rebellious letters from the Roman bishop to the overlord of the Empire, however, enounce for the first time and so decidedly the hierarchical principles and the consciousness of the supremacy of the Pope as

head of Christendom, that they served in after times as models to all succeeding Popes.[1] The later Papacy of the period of Gregory VII. and Innocent III. is here seen already developed in its chief characteristics.

"We can only address you," writes Gregory in his first letter to the Emperor, "in a rough, uneducated style, because you yourself are rough and uneducated." The Pope then proceeds to remind the Iconoclast of the Tables of Moses, the Cherubim of the Ark of the Covenant, and the original portrait presented, with His autograph, by the Saviour Himself to Abgarus, King of Edessa,[2] and informs the Emperor that there were many such pictures which proved a great attraction to pilgrims. These portraits were not idols, nor were the saints themselves worshipped; they were merely regarded as intercessors with Christ. "Free thy soul," he says to the Emperor, "from the denunciations heaped on thee by mankind. Even little children turn thee into ridicule. Go into the schools where they are learning the alphabet and tell them, 'I am the Emperor who wages war against the images,' and immediately they will hurl their writing tablets at your head. We, endowed with power and authority from S. Peter, would impose some punishment upon thee, were not the curse which thou hast laid upon thyself sufficient for thee and thy counsellors." In a later age Gregory would not have

[1] Both letters are found in *Act. Syn. II. Nicaen.* in Labbé, viii. 651. Baronius attributes them to the year 726; Pagi to 730; Muratori to 729.

[2] Baronius asserts that, after the capture of Constantinople by the Turks, the celebrated picture was brought from Edessa to Rome, where it is still preserved in S. Silvestro in Capite. *Annal. ad Ann.* 944.

hesitated to hurl the ban upon the Emperor, but at this period he dare not venture to make use of the weapon which was afterwards so formidable, and the days were yet far distant when powerful Kings and even Emperors could be placed under sentence of excommunication. Gregory pointed with self-satisfaction to the rebellion in the provinces, and informed the Emperor that the irritated populace had trodden his own portraits under foot, had driven out his officials and appointed others in their place, and that the people were on the point of doing the same in Rome, the Byzantine government not retaining power sufficient to hold the city. "But thou seekest to terrify us, and sayest, 'I will send to Rome and destroy the statue of S. Peter, and will even carry off the Pope in chains as Constans did Pope Martin.' Thou must know that if thou too nearly approachest us with threats it will not be necessary for us to descend to a contest, for if the Pope but move 24 stadia into the Campagna of Rome, thou mayst look to the winds."[1] When speaking of the celebrated statue of the Apostle, which the Emperor regarded as the chief idol of the West, he is so overcome with zeal as to contradict himself. "All nations of the West," he exclaims, "look with reverence on that image which thou in thy vainglory threatenest to destroy, on that of S. Peter, who, I tell thee, is regarded by all king-

[1] Εἰκοσιτέσσαρα στάδια ὑποχωρήσει ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς Ῥώμης εἰς τὴν χώραν Καμπανίας, καὶ ὕπαγε διῶξον τοὺς ἀνέμους. The Pope seems to speak with irony and exaggeration of the weakness of Byzantium, as being able, at the best, to rely upon its fleet. [Rather it is implied that if the Pope but get three miles' start of his pursuers, they may as well attempt to pursue the winds as him.—Translator.]

doms of the West as God upon earth.[1] Abstain from thy schemes; thy power and indignation cannot prevail against Rome, neither against the city itself, nor its power by sea. The entire West honours the holy Prince of the Apostles. Dost thou send messengers to destroy his image? then we declare ourselves innocent of the blood that is spilt, and on thy own head will it fall. We receive entreaties from the furthest West, from the so-called Septetus, who, with God's favour, desires to see our face, imploring us to go and make him a partaker of Holy Baptism, and we shall gird our loins in order that we may not be guilty of neglect."

We do not know to what unknown German barbarian monarch the Pope here alludes. He evidently wished the Emperor to understand that the influence of the Roman Church reached to the remotest West, and that even in these distant regions nations were prepared to rise in his defence. He appears to attach great importance to this baptism, referring to it again in a second letter. Gregory takes no thought of the Franks, who were summoned by his successor only a few years later to be the defenders of the city.

In a second letter he explains with more logical sequence the distinction between the temporal and spiritual powers—the powers, as he expresses it, of the Palace and the Church—and draws the line between the functions of this supreme judge who punishes secular offences with the sword, sentencing the body to imprisonment or death, and

[1] Ὃν αἱ πᾶσαι βασιλεῖαι τῆς δύσεως θεὸν ἐπίγειον ἔχουσι. Baronius does not even read ὡς θεόν. Peter was thus declared to be God, and that by the Pope himself.

those of the chief bishop who, "unarmed and defenceless," chastises the erring soul by the ban of the Church, not in order mercilessly to destroy it, but to lead it back to a godly life.

These memorable definitions mark, for the first time in the history of the Christian Church, the boundary which divides the temporal and spiritual powers, and show us the Church and the State standing in regard to one another as two opposing forces. This dualism, which plays so great a part in history, which filled the life of the entire Middle Ages, and continued down to our own times, was unknown to antiquity, where the Pagan Church, on account of its polytheistic divisions, was nothing more than a form of religion serviceable and subservient to the State. It also remained unknown to Constantine and his successors, who, after Christianity had become the religion of the State, naturally regarded themselves as heads of the Imperial Church. This was so simple an Imperial principle, that Leo the Isaurian, not in despotic arrogance, but in the calm self-consciousness of his sacred majesty, wrote to Gregory, "I am Emperor and I am priest."[1] And it was this saying which not only gave rise to Gregory's memorable definitions, but, at the same time, brought about the division between the two worlds, the spiritual and political, the Church and the Empire. Hence it suddenly came to pass that, within a space of one hundred and fifty years, the Roman Church had developed as an independent power, in which was concentrated the spirit of the West.

[1] Ὅτι βασιλεὺς καὶ ἱερεύς εἰμι: in the same letter.

3. ATTITUDE OF LIUTPRAND—HE CONQUERS RAVENNA—PRESENTS SUTRI TO THE POPE—THE POPE, THE VENETIANS AND GREEKS FORM A LEAGUE AGAINST HIM—THE KING ADVANCES AGAINST ROME AND RETIRES—A USURPER IN TUSCANY—DEATH OF GREGORY II., 731—GREGORY III.—ROMAN SYNOD CONVENED AGAINST THE ICONOCLASTS—ART IN THE WEST—BUILDINGS OF GREGORY III.—RESTORATION OF THE CITY WALLS.

Views and schemes of Liutprand.

From the furious struggle which now raged between Emperor and Pope, a third candidate in the lists, had he possessed but the requisite power and ability, might have derived an inestimable advantage. This was Liutprand, King of the Lombards. The lofty aim of the prince of this already Latinised nation was to unite Italy under one sceptre; an aim which it were impossible to realise otherwise than by the conquest of Rome and Ravenna. Even did no vision of the Imperial crown hover before his eyes, it is probable that he hoped at least to restore the kingdom of Theodoric. Italy was evidently about to sever herself from the Hellenised East, whose Emperor was no longer able to retain the reins of power; and the resuscitated Latin nation already looked forward to the possible restoration of a national Roman Empire, such as had existed in the time of Odoacer. Liutprand was sufficiently shrewd to decline all tempting proposals to enter into alliance with Byzantium. He beheld to his satisfaction the Greek provinces in revolt, and no doubt lent his aid to one or other party in the insurrection. The Exarch Paulus was slain by the

insurgents in Ravenna, and Liutprand, after having succeeded in taking the neighbouring Classe by surprise, not only sacked and destroyed the port, but entered the city itself. Advancing with his entire army, he made himself master of the capital of the Greeks in Italy. The year in which these important events took place is uncertain.[1]

The Lombard immediately occupied the cities of the Aemilia and Pentapolis. He entered the Roman Duchy, and, advancing as far as Narni, gave the Pope himself occasion for dismay. The date of this expedition is also unfortunately unknown.[2] A bold advance upon Rome would have placed the seat of papal power in the utmost danger, but gifts, entreaties, and diplomatic remonstrances on Gregory's part induced the King to retire. Liutprand, a pious Catholic, was not qualified to carry out the mighty task to which the time and circumstances seemed to have called him. He not only withdrew from the Duchy, but even surrendered Sutri, a town which he had conquered, to the Pope, who, in the name

Presents Sutri to the Pope.

[1] The conquest of Classe must be distinguished from that of Ravenna. The *Vita Gregorii II.*, p. 156 (Muratori's edition), only speaks of the capture of Classe (the passage is corrupt), and does not mention that of Ravenna. Paul. Diac., vi. c. 49, gives an account of the taking of Classe, and, in c. 54, of the conquest of Ravenna. The capture of the latter is also related by Agnellus, *Vita Johannis*, p. 409. W. Martens, *Polit. Gesch. des Langobardenreichs unter K. Liutprand* (1880), p. 37 and excursus, erroneously denies the conquest of Ravenna. This must have taken place previous to 730, perhaps about 727.

[2] Martens arbitrarily places it in the year 726, and previous to the undertaking against Ravenna. These events, which can no longer be established with chronological accuracy, are, even in Martens' work, as confusing as a labyrinth.

of the Apostle, laid some inexplicable claim to the city, the lawful property of the Greek Emperor. Sutri forms the first instance of a city being bestowed upon the Church.[1]

The astute Gregory won over the Lombard by means of a treaty, while at the same time he inwardly resolved to deprive him as quickly as possible of the Romagna. The Pope, striving to compass more than a powerful prince would have been able to achieve, already destined the Exarchate as the heritage of the Church. The design for the subjugation of Italy, which may have floated across the mind of Gregory the Great, but which could scarcely have there taken a definite shape, now assumed a decided form in the brain of the Roman bishop. The political intellect of the Pope was more powerful than that of the King whom he outwitted. Gregory II. turned to the flourishing republic of Venice, inciting it to the liberation of Ravenna, and sent his envoys to treat with the delegates of the Greek Emperor on the subject in the City of the Lagoons. Fear of Liutprand again induced Gregory to make advances even to the Emperor; and if a letter to the Doge, imputed to the Pope, be genuine, he had no scruple in denounc-

[1] *Facta donatione beatiss. Apostolis Petro et Paulo restituit atque donavit. Vita Gregorii II.*, n. 157. We have entered on the period of "restitutions." Sugenheim, &c., p. 11: "Sutri consequently appears as the first germ of the ecclesiastical state outside Rome." The conquest and gift of Sutri, which Liutprand only retained in his possession 140 days, took place in the eleventh Ind., therefore in 728. "Langob. Regesten" by Bethmann and Holder-Egger, *N. Arch. d. Gesell. für ältere deut. Gesch.*, 1878, p. 253.

ing the same Lombards who were his allies, pious Catholics and worshippers of images, as a "shameful people," at the same time that he terms his enemies, the Emperor and his son Constantine Copronymus, "his lords and sons."[1] We do him no injustice in asserting that he secretly stirred up the Dukes of Spoleto and Benevento against Liutprand. The history of papal diplomacy, which, descending by tradition from generation to generation, has in skill and subtlety surpassed the policy of all temporal courts and princes, thus begins with Gregory II. A Venetian fleet appeared before Ravenna, and Hildeprand, nephew of the King, vainly strove to defend the city against it. Hildeprand was taken prisoner, Peredeo, Duke of Vicenza, slain, and the Venetians, expelling the Lombard garrison, restored the Exarch Eutychius. Liutprand finally surrendered the seaports and the Romagna, and not only made peace with the Emperor, but united with the Exarch, in the hope of overcoming the Dukes of Spoleto and Benevento, and even of seizing the Pope.

Liutprand surrenders the Exarchate.

Both the Dukes legally stood in the relation of vassals towards the Lombard King; each, however,

[1] *A nec dicenda gente Longobardorum*—the customary attribute bestowed on this people by the Pope. The letter to Ursus of Venice, in Andrea Dandolo (Murat., xii.) and Labbé, *Concil.*, viii. 177. The Pope says: *ut ad pristinum statum sanctae Reipublicae in Imperiali servitio dominorum, filiorumque nostror. Leonis et Constantini magnor. Imperator. ipsa revocetur Ravennatum civitas, ut zelo et amore sanctae fidei firmi persistere, Domino cooperante, valeamus.* Martens, *l. c.* (*Excursus*, p. 66, f.), seeks to show that the letter is not genuine, but is obliged to admit that his view is unsupported by sufficient evidence. Muratori, it is true, had already cast doubts upon the letter. *Annal.* (729).

had already acquired an almost independent position,[1] and, since the dismemberment of the Lombard kingdom would have profited alike the Papacy and themselves, they used their powers in behalf of the Papacy. The vigorous Liutprand, however, succeeded in rendering Spoleto and Benevento again subject to himself. The two Dukes, Trasamund II. and Romuald II., made submission in Spoleto, taking the oath of vassalage about 729. The King forthwith hastened to Rome, accompanied by the Exarch, and encamped on the Neronian field. Had he now conquered the city, probably its history, and that of Italy and the Popes, would have assumed an altogether different form. It was necessary that any prince who aimed at the unification of Italy should strive to gain possession of Rome; and, if ever in history this great object were attainable, it was attainable now in 729, when, deserted by the Greeks and unsupported by other allies, the Pope stood utterly unprotected. But a mysterious power seemed to cast a spell around Rome and to prevent the German conquerors from becoming masters of the city and destroying its cosmopolitan character. As the defenceless Gregory boldly entered the camp of Liutprand, and addressed him in a speech conceived in the spirit of Leo the Great, the deeply-wronged King sank on his knees before him. The priestly magician led the disarmed enemy at once to the Apostle's grave, and the pious monarch laid aside his regal mantle, his

Liutprand encamps before Rome, 729.

[1] With regard to the relations in which the Lombard Dukes stood towards the kingdom, see H. Pabst, *Geschichte des Langob. Herzogtums, Forschungen zur deutsch. Gesch.*, 1861, vol. ii. p. 405, f.

sword, his very crown, together with his ambitious hopes, at the feet of the dead saint. Peace and reconciliation were effected, and, at the King's entreaty, the Pope released the Exarch from the sentence of excommunication. This one hour decided the future of papal domination. Brighter than the legendary vision which accompanied the interview of Leo with Attila, it shines in the record of the Papacy, and, three hundred years before the celebrated scene at Canossa, it testified to mankind the mysterious height to which the power of the Roman bishop had attained. Mankind, sunk in barbarism and ignorance, bowed before the sacerdotalism of the Church, in which it honoured the only divine power upon earth; and, in its recognised head, already acknowledged a saintly being of superhuman nature.

Under the spell of the Pope he withdraws from Rome.

Liutprand did not even enter the city, but broke up his camp and withdrew by the Flaminian Way. The crown of Italy, which for a moment had hovered above his head, thus vanished for ever from the grasp of a prince who lacked the energy to win it, probably to the misfortune of the country, the already scattered members of which he would have been able to unite. His people and his successors were soon called on to expiate his genuflexions in S. Peter's by a tragic overthrow.

The enterprise of a usurper put him to fresh shame. The affairs of Italy, sunk in dire confusion, offered a field of ambition to every enterprising spirit, and Tiberius Petasius, Dux of a city in Roman Tuscany, collected a band of followers,

suddenly rose in 730, and proclaimed himself Emperor. The Pope immediately placed the Roman army under the command of the Exarch, at the time in Rome, and the head of the rebel was despatched to Constantinople. Gregory, therefore, showed that he still acknowledged the Imperial supremacy. He had already been reconciled with the Exarch, and now wished to resume peaceful relations with the Byzantine government. Among the reasons which contributed to render this course desirable, were not merely the dread of the growing power of the Saracens in Spain, but undoubtedly also the more immediate alarm that, in case of the fall of the legitimate Imperial authority, he (the Pope) would sooner or later be forced into collision with the Roman people. The Church recognised that the necessary condition of her own existence at the time was the maintenance of Imperial authority.

Gregory II. died meanwhile, after a memorable reign of fifteen years, on February 10, 731. Under the guidance of this accomplished statesman, the Papacy had made gigantic strides towards temporal dominion.

The unanimous vote of both clergy and people now fell on a priest of Syrian descent, who was elected to the papal chair as Gregory III. on March 18, 731. His intimate knowledge of Greek, a highly valuable acquisition to a Pope in the existing state of affairs, was probably one of his chief recommendations, although Gregory III. possessed, in addition, other qualifications which rendered him worthy to succeed his eminent predecessor. From him the third

Gregory III., 731–741.

Gregory inherited the troublesome bequest of the Iconoclastic controversy, which had now become merely the symbol of division between the Church and the absolutism of the State. The first passionate fury of this memorable strife had died away, and been succeeded by a kind of truce without surrender on either side. The Emperor Leo greeted Gregory III. in an amiable letter, in which he expressed his hope of finding the new Pope more accommodating than his predecessor. Gregory, however, in his reply to the Emperor, reiterated the views of the former Pope in such an unhesitating manner, that the Nuncio entrusted with the delivery of the letter did not venture to fulfil his mission, but, returning to Rome, cast himself weeping at the feet of the Pope. The degradation of the cardinal, who had shown so little inclination to become a martyr for the sake of Image-worship, was, on the entreaties of a Synod and of the Roman nobility, commuted for an ecclesiastical penance, and the messenger was once more obliged to set forth for Constantinople in charge of the letter. Fortunately for himself, he was detained in Sicily by the Imperial Patricius, and there kept in prison for a year.

On November 1, 731, Gregory opened a Council: ninety-three Italian bishops, the Roman clergy, the representatives of the nobles and people, on whom the *Liber Pontificalis* bestows the title of "Consuls," assembled in S. Peter's.[1] The Synod passed the

[1] *Cum cuncto clero, nobilibus etiam consulibus, et reliquis Christianis plebibus adstantibus decrevit. Vita Gregor. III.*, n. 192. The recognised division of the three elective bodies in Rome.

sentence of excommunication against the Iconoclasts, and thus pronounced the separation between Italy and the Byzantine Empire. The Decrees of the Synod were to be taken by the Defensor Constantine to Byzantium, but again the papal messenger was detained in Sicily. Petitions from the cities of the Roman duchy for the toleration of the images met with the same fate; their bearers lingered eight months in prison, and were thence sent back with insults to Italy. The Emperor would receive neither messengers nor letters. Nevertheless, the discord still remained purely dogmatic; the Italian revolution being spent, the authority of the Emperor was formally recognised, and the Pope stood in such friendly relation with the Exarch Eutychius that the latter presented him with six valuable onyx pillars, spoils more probably of some building in Rome rather than of any in Ravenna.[1] These columns Gregory devoted to the adornment of the shrine in S. Peter's. He laid upon the pillars beams, and covered them with silver plates, on which were representations, in beaten work, of the Saviour, the Apostles, and various saints; evidently a protest against Iconoclasm. The Pope purposely provided the Roman churches with likenesses of the saints and with relics; since Constantine Copronymus, son of Leo the Isaurian, not satisfied with the destruction of images, also waged war against the honour paid to relics and against the worship of the saints.

[1] *Sex columnas onychinas volubiles concessas ab Eutychio exarcho, duxit in ecclesiam b. Petri Apostoli.*

Art in the West.

If, at the present day, we can unhesitatingly take part with the Byzantine Iconoclasts in their endeavours to purify religion from the Pagan influences which had penetrated therein, a consideration of the aesthetic requirements of mankind must lead us to moderate our judgment of their opponents. As among the ancients, so among Christian nations, art was the product of religion and public worship. However repulsive its tendency, and however defective the forms in which it appeared in those barbarous centuries, it was yet of the highest value in the civilisation of mankind. It raised men from the rough materialism of faith into the sphere of the ideal; placed before them the realm of the beautiful, in which all that was gloomy was transfigured and idealised by symbols; and during the dark night of superstition remained the sole surviving influence to cheer impoverished humanity with a ray of light. The struggle of the Papacy with the Byzantine Emperors saved it in the West; and Italy, which retained the polytheism of images, was able, if tardily yet triumphantly, to justify herself in the genius of Giotto, Lionardo, and Raffaelle.[1] At the time of the Iconoclastic struggle, many artists from the East made their way to Italy and Rome, where a hospitable reception invariably awaited them, and these men probably contributed to spread the stiff, dogmatic style of Byzantine painting throughout Italy, and, by the establishment of a traditional type, checked the free development of Western art. Historians, mean-

[1] The Byzantines, meanwhile, also diligently cultivated painting, justifying themselves in the person of their Raffaelle, Panselinos.

while, are silent with regard to the short-lived school of painting in the East.[1]

In like manner, many sacred pictures were rescued from the East. Many of those ancient, rough and black portraits of Christ and the Madonna, which are now exhibited in Roman churches, may have been brought thither from some Byzantine town during the Iconoclastic persecution; among them, not improbably, that likeness of Christ, "not made by human hands," now preserved in the chapel Sancta Sanctorum. The supposition that the picture was brought thither by some fugitive Greek is at least a more probable solution of its arrival than that, cast to the winds in Constantinople by the hand of the unfortunate Bishop Germanus, it was wafted to Rome by some favouring breeze. In any case, here it came, like many other sketches of the Apostle Luke, who wielded an invisible and angelic brush.

Gregory III. founded some churches and oratories. He erected a chapel for relics in S. Peter's, which he had covered with paintings;[2] founded the monastery of S. Chrysogonus in Trastevere, and rebuilt the deacons' house of S. Maria in Aquiro on the Campus Martius.[3] He further restored a great part of the

[1] Fugitive nuns founded the Greek convent of S. Maria in Campo Marzo (called also the convent of S. Gregory of Nazianzus) in the year 750. See the little chronicle of the convent, printed 1750.

[2] See, with regard to this chapel, the marble inscriptions of the Pope in the Crypt of the Vatican. They were dug up in 1495. De Rossi, *Due Monumenti Inediti spettanti a due concilii Romani de' secoli*, viii. e. ix.

[3] *Basilican S. Dei Genitricis quae in Aquiro dicitur. Vita*, n. 201. Other readings are: in Aciro, in Adchiro. Vignoli gives: in Cyro. The name was probably derived from that of some Roman

city walls, which his predecessor had scarcely had time to touch, providing the expenses of restoration out of the ecclesiastical treasury.[1] He also rebuilt the walls of Centumcellae, in fear of the Saracens, who already occupied Sardinia, and in terror also of a landing of the Byzantines. It is clear that he behaved as ruler in the Roman duchy.

4. Leo the Isaurian sends a Fleet against Italy—He confiscates Property belonging to the Roman Church—The Pope acquires Gallese—Enters into Alliance with Spoleto and Benevento—Liutprand invades the Duchy—Gregory turns to Charles Martel—Deaths of Gregory III., Charles Martel, and Leo the Isaurian, 741.

The Emperor sends a fleet against Italy.

The Emperor had by no means renounced his intention of punishing Rome and the other rebellious provinces, and in 733 he despatched a fleet under the Admiral Manes against Italy. The vessels, however, foundered miserably in the Adriatic. Thereupon he seized upon all ecclesiastical patrimonies in Calabria and Sicily, property from which the Church derived a yearly revenue of 35,000 gold pieces.[2] The ecclesiastical estates were numerous in Sicily; in Neapolitan territory also S. Peter owned property at Sorrento and Misenum, near Capua and Naples, and

Aquirius or Aquilius, who may have erected the church in his house. Silvio Imperi, *della chiesa di S. M. in Aquiro*, Rome, 1866.

[1] *Hujus temporib. plurima pars murorum hujus civitatis Romanae restaurata est. Vita*, n. 202.

[2] Theophan., p. 344. This confiscation is mentioned by Pope Stephen, *Cod. Carol.*, Ep. viii. 111, in Cenni.

even in the island of Capri.[1] The loss was naturally considerable. Seeking to indemnify herself elsewhere, the Church acquired the fortified place Gallese in Roman Tuscany, which had been annexed by the Lombard Duke of Spoleto, and which Gregory bought from Trasamund. According to the curious expression in the *Liber Pontificalis*, Gregory annexed Gallese to the Holy Republic and the Roman army.[2] Although the Pope again incorporated the town with the Roman duchy, which belonged to the Empire (the *Respublica*), he regarded it solely as belonging to the Roman territory, or to the narrower district of the city. The ambiguous expression, *sancta respublica*, is here as applicable to the duchy, which the Pope began to claim as the patrimony of S. Peter, as to the *Sacrum Romanum Imperium.* The Popes, while veiling their growing dominion over the city in a twilight of diplomatic art, with great sagacity

The Pope acquires Gallese.

[1] Cardinal Deusdedit, in his compilation (*Cod. Vat.*, n. 3833) at the end of the eleventh century, collected notices of the leases of estates from the registers of Gregory II. : *Theodoro Consuli in annis XXVIII. Insulam Capris cum monasterio S. Stephani*, for the yearly rent of 109 gold solidi, and 100 *megarici vini.* To the presbyter Eustachius was let the convent S. Martini in Sorrento ; to a deaconess the place in Campania, known as Icaonia ; to the Consul Theodore, for twenty-eight years, the convent S. Pancratii near Misenum. Borgia, *Breve Istor. del domin. Tempor.*, &c., Append. Docum. I.

[2] *Hujus temporibus Galliensium castrum recuperatum est—et in compage sanctae reipublicae atque in corpore Christi dilecti exercitus Romani annecti praecepit. Vita*, n. 203. The exercitus now begins to signify the populace itself. The opinion of Cenni (*Monum. Dominat. Pont.*, p. 14) : *Gregorius III. sanctam rempublicam* (state of the Church) *instituit*, is, however, unfounded, although, since the time of Gregory II., the Bishops of Rome cherished the project of the formation of a temporal principality.

allowed the forms of Empire to remain. To the chaotic conditions in which Italy was sunk, to the weakness of the Byzantine Emperors, and to their own audacity and energy the Popes owed this dominion. They delivered Italy from the Greek yoke and restored her to a place in the history of nations. They raised Latin nationality out of its state of depression, and rescued Rome, the seat of the Church, from the fate of becoming a Lombard capital. With the origin of the temporal power of the Papacy is associated the first national movement in Italy, and the history of all succeeding centuries teaches us that the Popes were strongest in Italy when they raised the national flag; weakest when they allowed it to fall.

Forms an alliance with Spoleto and Benevento.

The cession of the district of Gallese was the result of a secret treaty between Gregory and the Duke of Spoleto. Trasamund and Godschalk of Benevento sought to turn Italy's distress to their own advantage in order to render themselves independent of the Lombard King, and obtained Gregory's support. As Liutprand now advanced against Spoleto, Trasamund fled to Rome (739), where he sought and obtained protection from the Pope. Liutprand entered Spoleto, and demanded the surrender of the rebel, but the Pope and the Roman army, under the leadership of the ex-Patricius Stephen, as Dux of Rome, refused to give him up. The mention of this Dux alongside the Pope and the Roman army, shows that an Imperial official still remained in Rome as regent of the duchy; it further shows that Gregory acted in concert with the Exarch in Ravenna.[1] In

[1] *Dum—a Gregoria Papa atque a Stephano, quondam Patricio et*

consequence of this refusal, Liutprand advanced into the duchy, occupied Aemilia, Horta, Polimartium and Bleda, left troops behind in these different towns, and returned to Pavia (August 739), without having laid siege to Rome, or even, as it is asserted, sacked the Basilica of S. Peter. The Pope lent Trasamund the services of the Roman army to aid in the recovery of his dominions, and the banished duke was enabled to re-enter Spoleto in December.[1]

Returned thither, he refused any longer to be a party to the papal designs, more especially to aid in the recovery of the four cities; and while Liutprand prepared for an expedition against Spoleto and Rome, the Pope stood in no little danger. He recognised that Italian and Byzantine alliances were not sufficient to protect him against the just revenge of the Lombard King, and, consequently, turned to Charles Martel, the most powerful man in the West. The celebrated son of Pipin of Heristal, the hero of Poitiers, who, on the bloody field of battle, had delivered France for ever from the Saracens, was, under the guise of minister of a puppet King, the actual sovereign of the country; and, since the death of the Merovingian Theodoric in 735, without actually occupying the throne, may be said to have reigned supreme. The Popes had long since turned their eyes towards France, and it is said that Gregory's

Applies for help to Charles Martel, 739.

*Duce, vel omni exercitu Romano praedictus Trasimundus redditus non fuisset. Lib. Pont.*, n. 207, in the beginning of the "Vita Zachariae." Vignoli, it is true, gives *patricio et duce omnis exercitus Romani.* The other rendering, however, is of older date and in keeping with the character of the time.

[1] *Langob. Regesta* of L. Bethmann, *loc. cit.*

predecessor had already summoned Charles Martel to his aid.[1] Gregory himself had sent envoys to the Frankish prince (739), and two of the Pope's letters to Charles have survived to present times.[2] In the first, Gregory laments that Charles did not come to his aid; that he had given ear to the false representations of Liutprand or those of his nephew Hildeprand; and that he tolerated the hostile movements of the Lombards, who, in their scorn, had said, "Let Charles, to whom you have appealed, come with the army of the Franks and deliver you out of our hands." He reminds the Frank of some earlier attempt on his own part, and of a letter from Liutprand. Gregory's first letter, which is lost, must have been written when the King, in consequence of the treaty with the rebels of Spoleto and Benevento, first drew near. The two existing letters probably belong to 739 or 740, before Liutprand had taken possession of the four cities. Had they been the product of any later date, they would undoubtedly have contained loud lamentations on the part of the Pope over the loss

[1] This is assumed by Pagi, *ad. Ann.* 726, n. 13, 14; whose opinion is, however, based solely on the *Lib. Pont.*, "Vita Steph. III.," n. 235. Mühlbacher, *Regesten unter den Karolingern* (1881), is silent on the subject.

[2] With these letters begins the *Codex Carolinus*, one of the most important documents of history, and the pride of the Viennese library. This collection, instituted by Charles the Great, contains 99 letters of Gregory III., Stephen III., Zacharias I., Paul I., Stephen IV., Adrian I., and the Anti-pope Constantine, to Charles Martel, Pipin, and Charles the Great, dating from 739 to 791. Printed in Cenni's "Monum. Dominat. Pont.," in the *Cursus Completus Patrologiae*, ed. Migne, t. xcviii., recently by Jaffé. The superscription of these letters of Gregory III. runs: *Domno Excellentissimo filio Carolo subregulo Gregorius Papa.*

of these cities, while, as they stand, they only give vent to his complaints over the spoliation of the ecclesiastical property in the Ravennese territory and the devastation of the Roman duchy.[1]

"With what utter sorrow are we filled," exclaims Gregory in his first letter, "at these accusations, and that such illustrious sons do not venture to defend the Holy Church, their spiritual mother, and her dependents.[2] The Prince of the Apostles himself, O beloved son, with the power given him by God, may defend his house and his people, but he wishes to prove the hearts of the faithful. Do not give ear to aught that those monarchs may assert, since all that they write is false. Their pretext, that the Dukes of Spoleto and Benevento are rebels, is a falsehood. The only motive for their hostility is that the dukes refrained from attacking us in the past year, and refused to lay waste the property of the Holy Apostle or plunder his people; for the dukes explained, 'We do not make war against the Church of God and the people who belonged to her; we have a treaty with her, and have sworn faith to the Church.' The dukes are ready, according to ancient usage, to yield obedience to the Kings; the Kings, however, oppress them, in order to drive them away, and to fill their place with men of violence, who will daily harass the Church, rob the Apostolic Prince, and lead his people into captivity."

[1] Muratori (*ad A.* 741) confutes Baronius, who asserts that Liutprand had laid siege to Rome and sacked S. Peter's.

[2] *Populus peculiaris*, a new phrase, characteristic of the new epoch that had set in for Rome: the Roman people, the property and *pecus* of S. Peter.

The Pope adopted this tone in order to palliate the treaty which he was obliged to admit he had made with the rebels. He already denominates the inhabitants of Rome and the duchy the people "belonging to" S. Peter, and boldly introduces this foreign idea into legal language. He entreats Charles Martel to send an envoy to Italy, that he may inform himself of the distress of the Church, and implores him not to hesitate between the friendship of the Lombard King and devotion to the Prince of the Apostles, but to undertake the defence of Rome. The Pope sent at the same time by Anchard, the bearer of the letter, the long-customary, but now doubly significant, mark of distinction conferred on Catholic princes, namely, the golden keys of the Apostle's grave; by this symbol appointing the Frank Defender of the Sanctuary.[1] Charles Martel, however, probably from a sense of duty to the Lombard King, with whom he was on terms of personal friendship, declined to involve himself in any dangerous interference in the affairs of Italy. Not only had Liutprand taken the place of a father to the youthful Pipin in Pavia; in 739 he had also helped to drive the Saracens out of the South of France.

A second letter, despatched by the Pope to Charles, was equally fruitless. Such, in brief, are

[1] *Sacratissimas claves Confessionis B. Petri.* I am acquainted with the authors of the assertion, and the arguments they put forward in its behalf, that these keys were of a different kind from those which Gregory had so frequently sent to other princes. To me also the significance of the present gift seems to be of a more exalted nature, and to refer, at the same time, to the guardianship of the grave.

the contents of these letters of Gregory III., the only authentic documents regarding a step of such grave import in the history of the Papacy: a step destined to be later followed by consequences so unforeseen. The Frankish Prince is simply summoned to undertake the defence of the Church against Liutprand;[1] the exceptional right over Rome, supposed to have been offered by the Pope, is nowhere spoken of. It has, nevertheless, been asserted that Gregory III. invested Charles Martel, together with the title of a Patricius, or Consul of the Romans, with actual power over the city. This statement is supported by the authority of a chronicler, who asserts that in 741 Gregory despatched to Charles a second embassy bearing the keys of the grave, the chains of Peter, and handsome presents, and that the Pope invested the Frank with the Roman consulship, that is to say, complete jurisdiction over Rome, himself engaging to recognise the Emperor no longer.[2] A resolution

[1] *Nostris obedias mandatis, ad defendendam Ecclesiam, et peculiarem populum.* Second letter.

[2] Continuator Fredegar., iii. c. 110, in Ruinart's edition of Gregory of Tours: *Eo enim temp. bis a Roma . . . B. P. Gregorius claves venerandi sepulcri cum vinculis S. Petri* (fragments of iron)—*legationem—Principi destinavit. Eo pacto patrato, ut a partib. Imperatoris recederet, et Romanum Consulatum praefato principi Carolo sanciret.* Cenni, *Mon. Dom.*, p. 2, rejects the idea of this consulship. The annalist of Metz, writing 160 years after Gregory (*Monum. Germ. I., ad Ann.* 741), without mentioning the consulship, adds a *decretum Romanor. Principum;* the *Chronic. Moissiacense ad Ann.* 734 accords, almost word for word, with his account. Ruinart and Pagi accept the investiture of Charles with the Patriciate, and Muratori finds it confirmed by the passage in Gregory's first letter: *et ipsas sacratissimas claves confessionis B. Petri, quas vobis ad*

so weighty, however, as that of making over to a Frank, who, although powerful and renowned, was still nothing more than the first minister in his country, not only the right of defending Rome, but also temporal authority over the city, can be reconciled neither with Gregory's policy nor with the legal conceptions of the age.[1] Neither do we know what answer Charles Martel returned to the Pope. The invitation constituted an event of such importance that it doubtless formed a subject of public discussion in a national council of the Franks, who, as we shall see hereafter, were utterly adverse to the idea of war with the Lombards in behalf of the Pope. The answer brought to Rome by Charles's envoys must therefore have been a decisive refusal; hence the silence of the *Liber Pontificalis* on the subject. Meanwhile, the Lombard King continued his march towards Spoleto and Rome. Gregory, however, died on November 27, 741. Shortly before, on October 21, Charles Martel had passed away, and Leo the Isaurian had died on June 18. Thus death removed in rapid succession the three foremost men of the age.

regnum *direximus;* the dominion, that is to say, over Rome. Jaffé adheres to the reading *ad rogum* (entreaty).

[1] T. Breysig, *Jahrb. d. fränk. Reichs*, 714–741 ("Die Zeit Karl Martell's," 1869), believes in the transference of the "dominion over the community of the Roman city and district" to Charles Martel; a belief shared by Waitz, *Deut. Verfassungsgesch.*, iii². 83. But such a transference can in no way be meant. It is not possible to regard this "Patriciate" otherwise than as conferring on Charles the privileges of Defender and Champion of the realm,

## CHAPTER II.

1. Zacharias Pope, 741—He holds Negotiations with Liutprand—Journeys to meet him—New Lombard Donation to the Church—Second Journey of the Pope to Liutprand—Death of the King—Rachis succeeds to the Throne of Pavia.

Zacharias Pope, 742–752.

S. Peter's chair only remained four days unoccupied: Zacharias, the son of Polychromios, the last Greek who, in this age, wore the tiara, being elected Pope on December 3, 741. His family belonged to Siberena, the present S. Severina in Calabria, a province which had already given birth to a Pope in John VII., a native of Rossano. John had apparently induced the youthful Zacharias to follow him to Rome, where the latter entered the Benedictine monastery at the Lateran, and became a cardinal deacon during the reign of Gregory III.[1] If, as we can scarcely doubt, the election was notified to the Exarch, it could no longer have been considered necessary to wait for the Imperial ratification. The *Liber Pontificalis* bestows the highest praise upon Zacharias, and although the biography of

[1] *Di S. Zaccaria Papa e degli anni di suo Pontificato. Commentarii* of Cardinal Dom. Bartolini, Ratisbon, 1879.

each of S. Peter's successors in turn is opened with an official eulogium, with respect at least to the benefits acquired for the Church, the tribute in the case of Zacharias seems to have been well deserved. For to the Pope's determination, sagacity, and eloquence was in great part owing his ten years' reign of prosperity and peace; and since to him is due the translation of Gregory's *Dialogues* into Greek, it follows that, according to the age in which he lived, Zacharias was also a man of learning.

Liutprand being resolved to reconquer Spoleto and to punish Rome, the most pressing duty that lay before the new Pope was to avert the threatened danger. The death of Charles Martel, and the perplexed state of the Frankish government, which had now fallen into the hands of Charles's three sons, Carloman, Pipin, and Griffo (each at variance with the other), deprived Zacharias of every prospect of support from France. Aid from Byzantium was equally out of the question. The Pope therefore decided to enter into negotiations with Liutprand. They concluded the following treaty: the King promised to restore the four cities; the Pope, in return, to abandon Trasamund, and to unite his forces with those of the Lombards to effect the duke's overthrow. The treaty which the Church formed with Trasamund was to the same effect, and the same Duke whom Gregory had so eagerly defended against the accusation of high treason, was declared a rebel by Gregory's successor; unhesitatingly sacrificed to his own

Treaty with Liutprand.

advantage, and even overthrown by means of Roman arms.[1]

When the Duke recognised that he was undone, he threw himself at the feet of the King, and was dismissed to receive the cowl and tonsure, and Beneventum forthwith fell into the hands of Liutprand. The conqueror returned to Tuscany, but, as he made no show of surrendering the four cities, Zacharias left Rome in person, in the spring of 742, to exhort him to the fulfilment of the treaty. Liutprand no sooner heard of the Pope's departure than, sending envoys to meet him at Narni, he had him conducted with military pomp and a splendid retinue to Interamnium (Terni) in the Spoletan territory. The King himself here received his illustrious guest, in front of the Basilica of S. Valentine. The persuasive eloquence of the Pope won a rapid victory over the mind of the devout King. Liutprand surrendered Horta, Ameria, Polimartium, and Bleda, not to their lawful master, the Greek Emperor, but to the Church and S. Peter, and confirmed the donation by a document, which was deposited in S. Peter's.[2] This was the third Lombard donation by right of conquest to the Pope. The acquisitions of Zacharias did not end here. He further obtained from the aged King the patrimony of the Sabina, for the previous thirty years in possession of the Lombards, and the estates of Narni, Osimo,

Another Lombard donation to the Pope, 742.

[1] *Lib. Pont.*, "Zacharia," n. 208. Muratori here suppresses his opinion of the Roman policy, saying: *tralascio altre osservazioni.*

[2] *Praedictas quatuor civitates, quas ipse ante biennium abstulerat* (hence 740) *eidem sancto cum eorum habitatoribus redonavit viro. Quas et per donationem firmavit in Oratorio Salvatoris, sito intra ecclesiam b. Petri apostoli. Vita*, n. 210.

Ancona, Numana, and Valle Magna near Sutri, possessions of the Church which had been conquered by Liutprand himself. The King sealed his generosity with the ratification of a twenty years' peace with the duchy of Rome, and, on the Pope's request, restored all Roman or Greek prisoners to liberty. So great was the complaisance of the King and so great the genius of the Roman priest! Every mouthful that Liutprand swallowed at the papal table cost him a tract of land, and the aged King arose from his meal, saying, with a courteous smile, that he never remembered to have dined at so costly a rate.[1] The Pope departed on Monday, accompanied by Agiprand, Duke of Chiusi, and by some *Gastaldi*, who made over to him the possession of the four cities. Zacharias entered Rome, bearing "the Palm of Victory," and the shouts of the people that greeted his return proclaimed the city the property of the Pope. He addressed the multitude assembled in S. Peter's, and on the following day the populace marched in procession from the Pantheon through the Field of Mars to the Basilica of the Prince of the Apostles, to offer thanksgivings for the success that had crowned the papal efforts.

Zacharias was driven by urgent circumstances to

[1] *Ubi cum tanta suavitate esum sumpsit, et hilaritate cordis, ut diceret ipse rex, tantum se nunquam meminisse commessatum. Vita.* The *Lib. Pont.* says that the King walked half a mile beside the stirrup of the Pope. This is, accordingly, the earliest recorded instance of such an act of royal humiliation. In the same way Pipin accompanied Pope Stephen as his *vicestrator*. According to the donation of Constantine, such groom's service had even at that date been rendered by the Emperor to Pope Sylvester.

undertake his journey a second time the same year (742). For Liutprand, who had only concluded a separate peace with the Roman duchy (a fact which proves that he regarded the duchy as independent territory), now attacked Ravenna, the Aemilia, and Pentapolis. The Exarch Eutychius invoked the Pope's mediation, and the Exarch's entreaties were seconded by letters from the Archbishop John, from Ravenna, and from the other threatened cities. Zacharias endeavoured to gain Liutprand's consent by means of messengers and gifts, and, when these proved fruitless, went himself. He previously consigned the government of the city, however, to the Patrician and to the Dux Stephen.[1] The King did all in his power to avoid his impetuous guest, already received with all due honour by the Exarch, but earthly hindrances were of no avail against a saint who travelled protected by a cloud against the sun, and preceded by a troop of fiery warriors in the heavens.[2] Zacharias boldly entered Pavia, the Lombard capital, on June 28. After a long struggle, the King yielded to the wiles of the priest, whose eloquence held him spellbound; he restored his conquests to the Greek Empire, retaining as pledge but a third of Cesena and its territory, about which they were in treaty. This portion he also later restored

[1] *Lib. Pont.: relicta Romana urbe jam dicto Stephano Patricio et Duci ad gubernandum.* I repeat that I regard this Stephen as a Greek official. He was the last Imperial Dux in Rome. The series of these Duces, so far as we know them, is as follows: Christophorus, Dux 711; Peter, 713; Basilius, 717; Marinus, 718; Peter, 720; Stephen, 740. See Baldini's note to *Anast. Vita Const.*, vol. iv. 616.

[2] This is related with naïve seriousness by the Pope's biographer.

to the "Republic" on the return of the envoys from Constantinople.[1]

Death of Liutprand.

A short time after his successful journey the Pope was permanently delivered from his enemy by the hand of death. The magnanimous prince died after a reign of thirty-two years, and in him the star of his people set for ever. He, the greatest of Lombard Kings, had achieved the political union of his country, and rendered it a power formidable alike to Pope and Emperor. The satisfaction which filled Rome at the tidings of his death was increased a few months later by the overthrow of Hildeprand, his nephew and successor, and by the accession of Rachis, Duke of Friuli. Zacharias, who was well acquainted with the orthodoxy of the new King, greeted him with hearty congratulations, and received the confirmation of a twenty years' peace with the whole of Italy. Not only in the fall of Hildeprand, but also in the elevation of Rachis had papal statecraft played a part.[2]

2. Continued Recognition of the Emperor—Peaceful Relations with Byzantium—Carloman takes the Cowl—Rachis follows his Example—Astolf, King of the Lombards, 749—Pipin's Usurpation recognised by the Pope—Death of Zacharias, 752 — His Buildings at the Lateran — The *Domus Cultae*.

Survival of Imperial authority in Italy.

The fate of Italy now lay in the hands of the most

[1] *Parti reipublicae restitueret.* As early as the year 764 Paul I. speaks of *pars nostra Romanorum* (*Cod. Carol.*, xxiv., in Cenni, xxxviii.): here the ecclesiastical state is already formed.

[2] Sigurd Abel, *Der Untergang des Langobardenreichs in Italien*, Göttingen, 1859, p. 22.

fortunate of Popes. Peace was restored, and relations with the Emperor became more friendly than before. Though actually independent, the Roman Bishop respected the lawful authority of the State, exercised in Ravenna by the Exarch, in Rome by the Dux. And, in truth, it was solely to the exertions of the Pope that the Emperor owed the survival of his authority in these Italian provinces.[1] The names of the Iconoclast Emperors were still inserted in Bulls, and in the acts of Synods; and even in later times when the Franks had assumed the Protectorate of the Church, the Popes still continued to recognise the Imperial supremacy.[2] Cautiously veiling their temporal designs, they took care to obtain authentic stability from the Imperial authority for the rights or possessions which they acquired. Zacharias even received valid donations from the Empire. The energetic Constantine V., Copronymus, even more zealous an Iconoclast than his father, had recently overcome the usurper Artabasdus, whose name the Pope—untroubled by any scruples as to the legitimacy of succession—had inserted in the acts of the Council of the year 743. Constantine, however, found himself obliged to adopt a friendly attitude towards the Pope, and, on the request of Zacharias, presented him with the territory of Nympha and Norma, two cities in Latium.[3]

The Emperor bestows Norma and Nympha on the Pope.

[1] Philipps, *Kirchenrecht*, iii. 34.

[2] Adrian's Bull of 772, concerning certain estates of Farfa, says: *imperantibus domno nostro piissimo Augusto Constantino a Deo coronato magno Imperatore*, &c. Several Acts of Gregory III. and Zacharias contain similar chronological formulae.

[3] *Donationem in scriptis de duabus massis, quae Nymphas et Normias*

Fortune favoured Zacharias moreover with two still greater triumphs, which further increased the authority of the Church. As in the time of his predecessors the Romans had beheld Kings of Britain, clad in the habit of the novice, standing on the steps of S. Peter's, so, under Zacharias, they now witnessed the mystic power of the Church, displayed in the figures of two yet mightier princes who took the cowl.

Carloman becomes a monk.

In 747 Carloman, the eldest son of Charles Martel, decided to renounce his rights to the power and splendour of royalty and become a monk.[1] Boniface, the Apostle of the Germans, played a leading part in this pious tragedy, which left Pipin sole heir to his father's power and dominion, and which was fruitful of such great advantage to the Church. Carloman came to Rome, threw himself at the feet of the Pope, and entreated permission to receive the tonsure and monastic habit, and to end his days in a Roman hermitage. Zacharias willingly acceded to the request, and the royal penitent, after living some years in the city, withdrew to a wild mountain retreat in Etruria, to where, eight and twenty miles distant from Rome, lonely Soracte towers above the Flaminian Way and

*appellantur, juris existentis publici eidem s. et b. Papae S. R. Eccl. jure perpetuo direxit possidendas. Lib. Pont.*, n. 220. The Cyclopean walls of Norba still awaken our astonishment. The town becoming deserted, Norma was built beside it. Norma also in turn became deserted, when Nympha arose lower down. In the eighth century Nympha, and not Norma, seems to have been inhabited. Fear of the Saracens, however, apparently drove the population back to the shelter of the fortified town. See Westphal and Sir W. Gell, *ad loc.*

[1] *Jahrb. des fränk. Reichs*, 741–752 (1863), by Hein. Hahn, p. 89, f.

the adjacent Tiber. The classic associations of this hill of the Hirpinian shepherds, consecrated to the Sun-god, had perished, and the sight of the solitary mountain scarcely awoke in the mind of a single Roman any recollection of the verses once dedicated to it by Horace and Virgil.[1] Rather would the Roman of the eighth century have recalled the legend of Bishop Sylvester, who, in the days before Constantine's conversion, had fled for refuge to one of its rocky caves.[2] The loneliness and the natural beauty of the mountain fitted it for a hermitage, and a monastery—one of the earliest of the Campagna—had already arisen on its slopes.[3]

It was this rocky wilderness which Carloman chose for his grave. Here he either built a monastery to S. Sylvester, or enlarged one already existing. It endures to the present day.[4] He is also said to

[1] *Vides ut alta stet nive candidum*
*Soracte—*
—Horat., *Od.*, i. 9.

*Summe Deûm, sancti custos Soractis Apollo . . . .*
—Virgil, *Aeneid*, xi. 785.

[2] Adrian speaks of it in the letter to Constantine and Irene, *Act. Synod. II. Nicaen.*, Labbé, viii. 750: *misit ad montem Soractem, ubi S. Silvester—persecutionis causa—receptus. . .*

[3] Gregory (*Dialog.*, i. c. 7) describes it as situated on the summit of Soracte, but does not call it S. Sylvester. A monastery of S. Erasmus (Gregory, Ep. 24, i. Ind. 9) stood on the slope of the mountain. At what time the name of S. Oreste first appeared, is uncertain. It was derived from the word SORACTE, found on an inscription there, whence the cunning of ignorance constructed a saint, S. ORESTE.

[4] Pipin later presented the principal monastery to the Pope, who united it with S. Silvestro in Capite in Rome. See Paul's Bull in the *Cod. Carol.*, xii., Cenni, xxxii.; Mabillon, *Annal. Bened.*, xxii. n. 12; and, concerning Pipin's donation, *Cod. Carol.*, xvi., Cenni, xli. Egin-

have founded three other monasteries. The situation of the hill, however, close to the Flaminian Way, exposed the royal monk to the intrusive visits of noble Franks making pilgrimages to Rome, and after some years he withdrew to join the Benedictines on Monte Casino.

Monasteries arose in all directions, and lands, gifts, and souls were dedicated to the Church (*pro salute* or *mercede animae*), the Church being the sole and all-attractive, all-ensnaring power in a world sunk in ignorance and fear.

Surprising though the resolution of the Frankish prince may seem to us, his conduct was thrown into the shade by a yet more striking instance of renunciation. For Rachis himself, the pious King of the Lombards, laid aside the purple, and adopted in its place the Benedictine cowl. He had broken the treaty of peace in 749, had threatened the Pentapolis, and laid siege to Perugia. Zacharias went to him, as he had gone to Liutprand, and the fascinating traveller had not been more than a few days in the camp when Rachis declared himself ready, not only to renounce his designs on Perugia, but also to lay aside the crown.

Rachis embraces monasticism.

The King, his wife, the Roman Tasia, and his daughter, Rotrudis, cast away their royal garments

hard, in the *Life of Charles*, c. 2, says: *monachus factus in monte Soracte apud eccl. S. Silvestri constructo monasterio.* The mountain is called *Syraptim* in the MSS. of the *Lib. Pontificalis*, *Zirapti* and *Sarapte* in the chroniclers, as also in the chronicle of the monk Benedict of Soracte, belonging to the tenth century (*Mon. Germ.*, v.). The word *Syraptim* is derived from the *Acta Silvestri*. Duchesne, *Étude sur le liber pontificalis*, Paris, 1877, p. 166, f.

at the grave of S. Peter, and were clothed by the Pope with the mantles and veils of the cloistral life. Rachis also retired to Monte Casino, where, digging in a vineyard of the monastery, the Lombard prince may have found solace in the sight of the Frank Carloman performing some equally servile office, while Tasia and her daughter disappeared from sight in a neighbouring convent.[1] The remorse which Rachis later experienced clearly proves, however, that he had not taken the step wholly of his own accord. More probably the spirit of the Lombard nation, rising in revolt against the incapacity and the Roman tendencies which he displayed, as the Gothic had once risen against the Roman sympathies of the Amal, had led to his determination. Open rupture with Rome, and the establishment of an Italian kingdom under a Lombard sceptre, were the dominating ideas of the Lombard people.[2] The nation was, therefore, well satisfied to fill the place, left vacant by a weakling, with a brave warrior willing to carry these ideas into action.

Astolf, King of the Lombards

The hot-blooded Astolf, brother of Rachis, ascended the throne in Pavia with the firm intention of succeeding in the aim from which his timid predecessor had allowed himself to be dissuaded by

[1] *Lib. Pont.*, n. 223. Leo Ostiensis, *Chron. Casin.*, lib. i. c. 7 and 8. Among other princes who at this time entered the cloister, we may mention Hunold of Aquitaine and Anselm of Friuli, founder of the celebrated monastery of Nonantula near Modena.

[2] Sigurd Abel shows how Rachis had offended the national feeling of the Lombards, and how his subjects turned from him, when he allowed himself to be influenced by the Pope. *Untergang des Langobardenreichs*, p. 23.

the Pope. His hostile intentions drove the Pontiff, however, to renew his relations with the Franks. These relations had ceased, and the thought of Frankish intervention had been entirely renounced since the death of Charles Martel.[1] Meanwhile, an important event changed the whole situation of affairs and exercised momentous effects on Rome and Italy.

Pipin, King of the Franks.

Pipin, in full possession of the authority which his house had already long acquired, and, since the withdrawal of his brother, the sole heir of his great father, saw that the time had come when he might seize the crown. The ancient family of the Merovingians had fallen to decay; and Childeric III., the last to ascend the throne (743), was nothing more than the despised puppet of the kingdom. A change of dynasty, for which Pipin had paved the way, and of which Boniface, the Apostle of the Germans, had been a zealous advocate, was now to be effected; the usurpation, however, was to be justified by the papal ratification, as if by the divine sanction. To a free people belonged the right of taking the crown of the country from the head of an incapable prince, and of offering it to the energetic son of a hero, without any misgivings concerning the long succession of ancestors who had previously worn it and handed it down from one to another. The consciences of noble as well as peasant might, however, entertain doubts as to the lawfulness of breaking an oath, and

[1] The *Cod. Carol.* contains a single letter (of the year 748) from Pope Zacharias to the Major-domus Pipin, to the bishops and princes of France, but it relates to ecclesiastical affairs alone.

all scruples of this nature Pipin found himself obliged to appease. The Franks referred the question to a Council, and in 751 sent Bishop Burchard of Würzburg, and Folrad, Abbot of S. Denis, to Rome, to ask the Pope whether the Frankish nation, wishing to depose the effete Childeric and to elect their renowned duke as King, could be released from their oath of allegiance. Zacharias quickly grasped the importance of the question. He answered in the affirmative, acknowledged that the source of all power, even the royal, lay in the people themselves, but declared the right subject to the papal sanction. Fear of Astolf was not the only motive that impelled him to recognise the usurper. A more powerful inducement was that which now presented itself,—that of arrogating to himself the office of supreme arbiter between kings and peoples. The necessities of a usurper thus raised the position of the Roman bishop to an immeasurable height; and the incident forms one of the most decisive moments in the history of the Papacy, giving, as it did, occasion to the Popes to proclaim the theory that they, through the grace of God, possessed the power to bestow crowns and to take them away.[1]

It is uncertain whether or not Zacharias survived the coronation of the usurper. He died on March 14, 752, and in the same year (the last descendant of the great Chlodwig having been already banished to a monastery), Bishop Boniface, the papal legate,

[1] Theocratic ideas begin with Pipin. He first used the words, by the grace of God. G. Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgesch.*, iii. 198.

in presence of a diet of the kingdom assembled at Soissons, anointed Pipin, and placed the crown of Childeric on his head.[1]

Buildings of Zacharias in the Lateran Palace.

Although the ten years of Zacharias' reign had been spent in peace, he left behind but few monuments of his rule. His chief care had been devoted to the Patriarchium of the Lateran, since, now that the power of the Popes had so largely increased, their dwelling seemed to call for a greater splendour of adornment. The Lateran Palace, which immediately adjoined the Basilica of Constantine, formed the centre of their spiritual as of their temporal government, while the Vatican was the centre of the faith, or the seat of the Prince of the Apostles. The Patriarchium contained the archives of the Church and the Treasure Chamber, and was the dwelling, at the same time, of the Popes and their courts. Enlarged by degrees, it included, besides the great basilica, several smaller churches, many oratories, triclinia or dining halls, and several chapels, among them the celebrated private chapel of the Popes, called S. Lorenzo or, later, Sancta Sanctorum. Close to the basilica stood the Baptistery, the Monastery of SS. John the Baptist and the Evangelist, that of S. Andrew and Bartholomew, apparently another monastery already dedicated to S. Stephen, and a fourth to SS. Sergius and Bacchus. These buildings, like

[1] Le Cointe, *Annal. Eccl. Francor. ad Ann.* 752. According to Heinrich Hahn, *Jahrb. d. fränk. Reichs*, 741–752, p. 145, the precise date of Pipin's elevation cannot be ascertained. The Frankish assembly which elected the new King may have assembled either in the beginning of the year 752, or at the end of July or the beginning of August.

the present Vatican, formed of themselves a little town of labyrinthine plan.[1]

Zacharias enlarged the Patriarchium and decorated it with greater splendour. He built a portico, furnished with a tower, in front of the façade of the palace. This building was afterwards called by preference the Palace of Pope Zacharias, or, in popular speech, the Casa Maggiore.[2] The portico, decorated with paintings, gave access to the tower, which contained a triclinium, in which the various countries of the earth were depicted in colours.[3] Thus was continued once again the great world-embracing idea of Rome, out of which had originated the *Orbis pictus* of Agrippa, and the plans of the city of Imperial times.

Zacharias did not build any new churches; and we may here observe that, for a considerable length of time, architecture in Rome had produced nothing great. So many churches had arisen in the city prior to the seventh century, that the task of keeping those already existing in repair was work sufficient for any Pope. Zacharias provided several basilicas with silken draperies, which either served as coverings for the altars or to hang between the columns of the nave. With these oriental draperies a greater

[1] See plan in Severano, *delle 7 chiese*, i. 535; executed by the architect, Fr. Contini, from Buffalini's plan of the city, from drawings in S. Pietro in Montorio and in the Vatican, also from tradition. I refer the reader also to Tab. xxxvii. of the *Basiliken des Christlichen Rom.*, by Gutensohn and Knapp.

[2] *Ducitur ad palatium Zachariae Papae, quod vulgariter dicitur Casa major. Ordo Roman.*, xiv., in Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.*, ii. 260.

[3] *Fecit autem a fundam. ante scrinium Lateranese porticum atque turrim . . . descriptionem orbis terrarum. Vita*, n. 218.

luxury was introduced. On them were represented Biblical scenes, and the *Liber Pontificalis* informs us that on the covering of the altar, ordered by Zacharias for S. Peter's, the birth of Christ was depicted in gold tissue.[1]

Zacharias attempts to colonise the Campagna.

The exertions of the Pope, with regard to the cultivation of the deserted Campagna, redound to his honour. The Popes found it necessary to take active measures for the promotion of agriculture, since the city, which had long since been deprived of its stores from Africa, now found itself also robbed of its granaries both in Calabria and Sicily. The scattered estates of the Church in Etruria and Latium furnished a partial supply, but the demand rose with the population, which, swollen by fugitives from the Campagna seeking shelter from the Lombards, had rapidly increased. The desolation of the Campagna, although probably not so great as at the present day, spread with fearful rapidity, owing to the dearth of free landowners. The Church, through purchase and donations, had gradually appropriated more and more soil, but as she failed to pursue any system of colonisation on a large scale, she found herself utterly unable to cope with the distress. Nevertheless, the efforts of the Popes for the cultivation of the Campagna at this period are highly honourable.

The erection by Zacharias of five *Domus cultae*, or farms in which the colonists established themselves, deserves our attention. The first Lauretum with the Massa Fontejana bore the title Paonaria, and was

[1] The technical expression is *vela—vela serica alytina* from ἄλυτος, *insolubilis*, or from ἀληθινός, genuine?

apparently a large estate on the Via Aurelia.[1] The second was called S. Cecilia, from a chapel of the name at the fifth milestone on the Tiburtine road. Zacharias also founded a third *Domus culta*, undistinguished by any name, fourteen miles from Rome in the Tuscan patrimony. He finally acquired the estates Antius and Formia, situated doubtless near ancient Antium in the Volscian territory.[2]

The colonisation of the Roman territory by the Church did not, however, in any case entail an entirely new foundation, but consisted simply of a colony planted in the deserted villas and villages of antiquity. While the forsaken cities of the ancients, such as Gabi, Caere, Labico, Ficulea, and even a village such as Subaugusta, on the site of the ancient villa of Helena Augusta, were converted into episcopal sees, agricultural colonies were established on former country seats of the ancient Romans, and on the site of destroyed villages, the ruins of which were again rendered habitable.[3]

[1] The list of the estates of the Ager Romanus by Eschinard cites Fontignano in S. Paolo. These foundations are treated of in the *Lib. Pont.*; also by Nibby, article "Lauretum," *Anal. de' Dintorni di Roma*; more thoroughly by G. Tomassetti, "Della Campagna Romana" (*Arch. d. Soc. Rom.*, vol. iii. 318, f.). These topographical designations are, however, very obscure; and it remains doubtful whether the *dom. cult.* was called "Lauretum" or "Laurentum," the ancient seat of King Latinus.

[2] *Massas quae vocantur Antias et Formias, suo studio jure b. Petri adquisivit; quas et domus cultas statuit. Lib. Pont.* Formias is more probably to be discovered in the Massa S. Petri in Forma, which was afterwards the so-called Latifundium Campomorto, rather than in the neighbourhood of Gaeta.

[3] Subaugusta, the present estate of Centocelle, was, in the early

The revenues of the property managed by the Church undoubtedly could not have been very great. About 715 Gregory II. set apart, for the maintenance of the lamps in S. Peter's, the proceeds of forty-eight estates, which lay scattered over the country as far as Anagni, and were devoted to olive-farming.[1] The farms were let to Roman nobles in emphyteusis, apparently at a very low rent. Thus Zacharias conferred the Massa Pelagiana in the Patrimonium Labicanum on the Comes Filicarius, and the Massa Gallorum and Appiana on the Roman Christoforus. To the latter also belonged the ancient Gabii, which, although giving a title to a bishop, had sunk to the level of a fundus.[2]

### 3. Stephen II.—Astolf conquers Ravenna, 751—Stephen seeks Aid from the Emperor, afterwards from Pipin—Journeys to France—Consecration of Pipin and his Sons, 754—Defensive Treaty of Kiersey—Pipin appointed Patricius of the Romans.

Stephen II., 752-757.

The presbyter Stephen was elected successor to Zacharias, but died only three days after his nomina-

Middle Ages, a suburban diocese. Its bishop is mentioned as Subaugustanus in the *Acts of the Synod of Symmachus*, A.D. 499. A. Thiel, *Ep. R. Pont. Genuinae*, i. 642. Some ancient "Pagi" in the neighbourhood of the city were Succusanum, Lemonium, Aurentinum, Pelicianum, Ulmanum. With regard to this subject, see G. Tomassetti, *I Centri abitati nella Camp. Rom. nel medio evo*, *Rassegna Italiana*, vol. ii. 1883, p. 375, f.

[1] The ancient inscription is built into the wall of the portico of S. Peter's. The Bull in the *Bullar. sacr. Basil. Vatican.*, i. 7.

[2] Bartolini, *di S. Zaccaria*, p. 552, f.

tion. Stephen II., a Roman, was then appointed to the vacant chair on March 25, 752.[1]

Under the pontificate of this conspicuous man a new era dawned for Rome. A short time before, King Astolf had succeeded in attaining that which his predecessors had long striven for in vain. The seat of Byzantine rule in Italy had fallen into his hands; and as early as July 4, 751, he was able to issue a royal decree from the palace in conquered Ravenna.[2] Eutychius, the last of the Exarchs, was portioned off with Ferrara and other districts under Lombard supremacy, and, after a course of nearly two hundred years, the rule of the Greek satraps came to an end. Its extinction entailed momentous issues, and the question had now to be decided, whether or not the Lombard King was to be lord of Italy. Immediately after the conquest of Ravenna, Astolf departed for the south to reconquer Rome, the duchy, and all the remaining Byzantine provinces, which he now claimed as successor to the Exarch or Emperor. Stephen, however, by means of an embassy, succeeded in arresting his march (June 752). The King yielded, and swore a twenty years' peace with the Roman duchy. In the course of four months, however, he repented his weakness, demanded the yearly tribute

Ravenna conquered by Astolf, 751.

Claims possession of Rome.

[1] He ranks, it is true, as Stephen III., if his predecessor be reckoned in the list of ordained Popes.

[2] Muratori has been enabled to determine the date from a diploma of the abbey of Farfa, dated by Astolf: *Ravennae in Palatio, IV. die m. Julii A. feliciss. regni nostri III. per Indict. IV. feliciter. Antiq. Ital. Diss.*, 67; Fatteschi, n. x. 264; Fantuzzi, t. v. n. viii. The mutilated history of Agnellus is silent concerning this important event.

of a gold solidus from every Roman, and finally announced his intention of incorporating the city with his kingdom.[1]

On hearing of his threat, Stephen sent the Abbots of Monte Casino and S. Vincenzo on Vulturnus, the two most celebrated Benedictine monasteries in Italy, to the King. The envoys were, however, refused admittance, sent back to their monasteries, and forbidden to see the Pope.[2] Meanwhile the Byzantine Emperor demanded the restoration of the Exarchate, which had been torn from his realms. He did not, however, resort to arms, but merely sent letters by his plenipotentiary to the Pope and the Lombard King. Stephen sent this envoy, accompanied by Paul, his own brother, back to Astolf, and, as was expected, the embassy proved unsuccessful. The danger grew more pressing. The Pope called upon the incapable Emperor, his overlord, to send troops to wrest Rome and Italy by force of arms from the enemy. For Astolf demanded unconditional surrender, and threatened to massacre the Romans as soon as he had carried the city by storm.

Reduced to these grievous straits, Stephen ad-

[1] *Et suae jurisdictioni civitatem hanc Romanam, vel subiacentia ei castra subdere indignanter asserebat.* The *Lib. Pont.* from this time onwards is fairly accurate and trustworthy. *Chron. Vulturnense*, lib. ii. 401 ; Murat., *Script.*, i. p. 2.

[2] The celebrated monastery of S. Vincentius on the Vulturnus, in the diocese of Isernia, was founded by three Lombards, brothers, Tato, Taso, and Paldo, about the year 703. For a considerable time it contained about 500 monks. Paul. Diacon., vi. c. 40, and the chronicle of the monastery from the Barberini Library, edited by Muratori.

dressed the people in a sermon, as Gregory the Great had previously done in a similar situation. He roused the religious and patriotic passions of the citizens; a procession was formed, which, headed by the Pope himself, bearing on his shoulders the likeness of the Saviour "not made by hands,"[1] marched to S. Maria Maggiore. Attached to the cross, borne in the procession, was Astolf's proclamation of peace, and God and the people were invoked as witnesses of the act of perjury on the part of the King. Stephen did not, however, remain satisfied with processions. Before Constantine had had time to give an answer to the messengers, the Pope recognised that the Greek Emperor was not in a position to undertake afresh the conquests of Justinian. The history of Europe followed uninterruptedly its westward course, and centred in the vigorous German tribes; it left the Byzantines to their dogmatic sophistries and their weary struggles with the Slavs and Mohammedans, while Rome, renouncing Greece, threw herself into the arms of the Franks.

Stephen, mindful of the relations of his predecessor

[1] *Procedens in laetania cum sacr. imag. Dom. Dei et Salvatoris nri. J. Christi, quae acheropita nuncupatur. Vita*, n. 233. The first mention of this sacred picture. It is painted on wood, is dark, represents the Saviour with a beard, and is entirely Byzantine. See illustration in Marangoni, *1st della Capella di Sancta Sanctor.*, Rom., 1747. It was used in processions in the Middle Ages, and on the vigil of the Assumption was washed in the Forum, as in former days the statue of Cybele in the Almo (*Ordo Roman.*, xi.; Mabillon, *Mus. It.*, ii. 151). Andr. Fulvius, *Ant. Rom. I. de Ostia*, towards the end; Martinelli, *Roma ex. ethn.*, 157; Marangoni, *Cose Gentil.*, c. 28, 105. The nocturnal procession, having degenerated into a Bacchanalian rout, was abolished by Pius V.

with France, where Pipin, with the consent of the Pope, had assumed the crown, was driven by necessity to a step, the historic results of which he did not grasp at the time. He secretly sent letters to Pipin by a pilgrim, imploring his aid, and even requesting an interview. These first letters, belonging to the year 753, have, however, unfortunately perished. The new King of the Franks eagerly accepted a commission which brought him into contact with Rome, and might prove of such incalculable importance towards the development of his kingdom. He sent the Abbot Droctegang from Görz to treat with the Pope, and soon afterwards the Duke Autchar, and Chrodegang, Bishop of Metz, to escort the Pontiff to France.[1] The usurper of Childeric's throne had found it necessary to appease the murmurs of the nation by a solemn consecration at the hands of the Pope. The Pope, a rebel towards his lawful Emperor, and Pipin, the usurper of the crown of his lawful King, drawn together by ties of mutual need and gratitude, moulded anew the history of nations. In the background, behind Rome in need of a protector, and behind the youthful dynasty of the Carolingians, stood the Germanic-Roman Empire, which soon appeared as the result. The gradual development of this ecclesiastico-political system from such insignificant beginnings and from temporary needs, forms one of the most instructive chapters in the history of the world.

The Pope summons Pipin to his aid, 753.

[1] The two letters of Stephen, that to Pipin (*Cod. Carol.*, x.) and that to the dukes of the Frankish people (xi.), which Cenni has fittingly put in the first place, refer to these events.

Rome was in a state of the greatest excitement. The question to be decided was, whether with the title of Patricius the Protectorate of the city was to be formally made over to the King of the Franks, and the foreign monarch thereby endowed with a permanent and powerful position in Rome. The step was too momentous to be undertaken on the responsibility of the Pope alone. It was doubtless submitted to the Roman people assembled in parliament, and Stephen was by them invested with authority to conclude a treaty with Pipin, after the people had elected him their Patricius. The journey of a Pope to France was an event hitherto unheard of. No Roman bishop had ever crossed the Alps to visit a German nation in the West. While Stephen prepared for his journey in the autumn of 753, the Silentiarius John of Constantinople arrived with his emissaries, bringing, instead of arms, the Imperial command that the Pope should repair in person to the court of Astolf, and prevail on the Lombard to surrender the Exarchate.[1] It is uncertain whether Stephen informed the Greek envoys of his negotiations with Pipin, whose messengers were to accompany him on his journey. Taking the Imperial minister, several dignitaries of the Church and leaders of the Roman militia with him, he set forth, provided with a safeconduct by the Lombard King, to visit Astolf, and left Rome on October 14, 753. On the occasion of his predecessor's journey to Liutprand, the government of the city had been entrusted to a Dux, but Stephen instead committed "the entire

[1] *Jussionem Imperialem*, says the *Lib. Pont.* in the customary style.

people of the Lord to the care of the Saviour and the Apostle Peter."[1] He doubtless left spiritual concerns in the hands of a vicar, while some official, a Dux or consul, already appointed by the Romans, conducted temporal affairs.

Stephen journeys to Astolf

Stephen's journey led him through the midst of the Lombard troops who garrisoned the duchy. Before he reached Pavia the King sent orders forbidding him to mention the restitution of the Exarchate and of the other cities of the Empire. Stephen, however, replied that it was useless to try to intimidate him. Neither would Astolf consent to the Pope's journey to France, with regard to which Pipin's envoys were urgent in their entreaties. The Lombard foresaw the consequences of a journey which, on account of his powerful rival, he was unable to prevent. Stephen left Pavia on November 15, 753, with an escort of bishops and cardinals, and doubtless also attended by Roman magnates, plenipotentiaries of the nobles and people. He soon reached the Alps, where, at the convent of S. Maurice, he had hoped to meet Pipin; but instead of the King, his deputies, the Abbot Folrad of S. Denis and the Duke Rothard, alone made their appearance. The royal envoys, however, invited the Pope to proceed with them to France, where Pipin awaited him at the castle of Ponthion (*Pons Hugonis*).[2] Arrived at Ponthion,

and to Pipin, 753.

[1] *Commendans cunctam dominicam plebem bono pastori Domino nostro*, &c. The expression *Dominica plebs*, so frequently used in the *Cod. Carol.* to denote the Romans, is, like the phrase *peculiaris populus*, very significant.

[2] The Primicerius Ambrosius died at S. Maurice. His barbarous epitaph (in the crypt of the Vatican) says :—

Stephen was received with all due honour by the royal family (January 6, 754). Pipin dismounted from his horse on the Pontiff's approach, threw himself on the ground before him, and then proceeded on foot some distance beside his guest, who remained on horseback.[1] At Ponthion, however, Stephen in turn humbled himself before his powerful defender, and on his knees implored Pipin to lend his protection to the cause of S. Peter and the Roman republic. Pipin swore compliance; Stephen was soon after conducted to Paris, and there took up his abode in the monastery of S. Denis. Here, for the first time, the *Liber Pontificalis* mentions the French capital, and we pass in thought over a space of more than a thousand years, to glance at the remote consequences of Stephen's journey; to the time when the usurper Napoleon invited Pius VII. to the northern capital for ends almost identical with those of his remote predecessor.

Stephen consecrated Pipin, his wife Bertrada, and his sons, Carl and Carloman, in the church of S. Denis (July 28, 754), and forbade the Franks, under threat of the ban, ever to elect as King any but one of the Carolingian family, now pronounced legitimate.

Pipin's thanks did not consist in words. Already

*Ex hac urbe processit suo secutus pastorem*
*In Roma salvanda utrique petebant regno tendentes Francorum*
*Sancta perveniens loca B. Mauritii aulae secus fluvii Rhodani*
*Litus ubi vita noviliter ductus finivit mense Decemb. . . .*

—Galletti, *Del Primicer.*, p. 41.

[1] *Cui et vice stratoris usque in aliquantum loci juxta ejus sellarem properavit.* "Vita Steph.," c. 25.

the reward demanded by the Pope had been agreed upon either in Ponthion or Kiersey (Carisiacus).[1] Letters of Stephen show that Pipin had privately promised not only to rid him of the Lombards, but to place the Roman Church in possession both of the patrimonies of which she had been deprived, and of certain other territories in Italy, so soon as the Frankish King had acquired them himself. These territories were the Exarchate and Pentapolis, which legally belonged to the Emperor, and were garrisoned by Astolf; a fact which their subsequent surrender to the Pope renders indisputable. This promise, given by Pipin in 754, forms the foundation on which the structure of his temporal dominion was reared by the Roman bishop. That the promises had reference to other territory is improbable. The document, however, relating to this treaty, with which the "Roman question" was created, is unknown to us. The views of such writers as place the later fictitious donations of the Carolingians and their successors on the same level with the compact made between Pipin and the Pope, and assert that at this period a formal partition of Italy was agreed upon between the two potentates, are devoid of all

[1] Jaffé, *Reg. Pont.*, fixes the date of the treaty of Kiersey on the 14th April 754. It is not, however, ascertained that the treaty was executed at Kiersey. The continuator of Fredegar is only aware of the promise made at Ponthion; the "Vita Stephani" in the *Lib. Pont.* merely says that the fulfilment of the promise was determined on at Kiersey. Only the "Vita Hadriani" speaks of Kiersey as the place of the treaty. Hence W. Martens (*Die Röm. Frage unter Pipin u. Carl d. G.*, 1881) only recognises a vow made by Pipin at Ponthion, and then transactions at S. Denis. On the other hand, see Oelsner, *Jahrb. des fränk. Reichs unter König Pipin*, 1871.

foundation, and can neither be reconciled with the conception of law, nor with the practical international relations of the time.[1]

Pipin entered into a legal relation with the Roman Church and its supreme head. He promised that he and his successors would defend the Church and provide her with territories. The Pope, on his side, undertook never to desert the new dynasty. A mutual treaty, offensive and defensive, was concluded.[2] The Imperial supremacy was still silently acknowledged in principle; nevertheless, Stephen appointed the Frankish King Defender of the Church and her temporal possessions. He boldly arrogated to himself the rights of the Emperor in investing Pipin and his sons with the title of Patricius, a title hitherto borne by the Exarch. The appointment of Pipin as Patricius, and Patricius moreover

And appoints him Patricius of the Romans.

[1] Ficker, *Forschg. z. Reichs u. Kirchengesch. Ital.* (1869), ii. 333, f., asserts that the form of the first donation of Pipin is retained in the formulae of later deeds of gift, and that these are derived from sources essentially genuine; that Pipin formed a treaty of partition with Stephen, and promised the Pope the land south of Luni (p. 366, f.). Genelin, *Das Schenkungsversprech. u. d. Schenkg. Pipin's*, 1880, adopts the exposition of Ficker. See, on the other hand, Sybel, "Die Schenkungen der Karolinger an die Päpste" (*Kl. Histor. Schrift. B.*, iii. 1881). The forged deed of gift of Pipin, which bears no date, is to be found in Fantuzzi, *Mon. Ravenn.*, vi. n. ic.

[2] Stephen III. thus clearly expresses himself to Carl and Carloman in 770 (*Cod. Carol.*, 45, Cenni, 49): *vos b. Petro, et praefato vicario ejus, vel ejus successoribus spopondisse, se amicis nostris amicos esse, et se inimicis inimicos, sicut et nos in eadem sponsione firmiter dinoscimur permanere.* Paul I. likewise expresses himself (*Cod. Car.*, xvi., Cenni, xli., and in the following letter). Thus Pipin undertook the *defensio et exaltatio Ecclesiae* in a spiritual and temporal sense.

of "the Romans," was not, however, a single-handed action on the part of the Pope, but must rather have been the result of a decision of the Roman people. Stephen, who went to France accompanied by some of the leading Romans, was the bearer of the resolution, and Pipin unhesitatingly accepted the dignity of Patricius. As such the Romans and the Pope constituted him a Roman citizen and head of the Roman nobility, permanently identifying him with the interests of the city. The title of Patricius henceforward attained an historic importance. Originally the title had not conferred any official authority; but, since the time of Constantine, it had been an exalted dignity conferred for life, and even bestowed upon barbarian kings. With the institution of the Exarchate this dignity seemed by preference to have been conferred on the Exarchs, and, in consequence, the idea arose that it was the special province of the Patricius to superintend the papal elections and act as Advocate of the Church.

The position in which the Frankish prince stood towards Rome, the duchy, and the Exarchate was accordingly expressed by a Roman title. It is nevertheless striking that, in the papal letters, this title is never associated with the conception of a Defensor. Never is it indicated, that on the King, as Patricius of the Romans, devolved the duty of defending the city; the Popes astutely derived this duty from a divine call, of which consecration was the symbol, or indefinitely from the treaty with Stephen. They apparently evaded the true meaning of the Patriciate on purpose, desiring it to be

regarded, not as a political right, but as a title of honour, such as in times past had been borne by Chlodwig, Odoacer, and the Burgundian Prince Sigismund.[1] Pipin himself never makes use of the title, and it is Charles the Great who, for the first time, in 774, makes himself in documents, *Patricius Romanorum, Defensor Ecclesiae.* A later formula very clearly expresses the connection of the two ideas. The *Graphia of the Golden City of Rome*, which belongs to the latter half of the tenth century, contains, among other matters, an account of the ceremonial of the investiture of a Patricius. It informs us that when the patrician is elected he first kisses the Emperor's feet, knees, and mouth, afterwards all the Romans, and they all cry "Welcome." The Emperor, addressing him, says: "It appears too difficult to us to fulfil alone the office entrusted to us by God. We therefore constitute thee our helper, and invest thee with this honour,

[1] Pipin is merely spoken of as Defensor or Protector. Cenni, 74, 79, 82, 141, 146, 150, 160, 167, 170, 181–184, 187, 189, 190, 191, 196, 199, 208, 210, 212, 220, 222, 227, 233, &c., everywhere Defensor! I reject the opinion of Ducange that the Patriciate was thus early the Dominium. Borgia, *Breve Istor.*, p. 51, and *Memorie Stor. di Benevento*, p. 13, sees in it the position of Advocate of the Church, and this view is justified with regard to the time of Pipin. The Dominium of Pipin is also rejected by B. Niehues, *De Stirpis Karolinae Patriciatu*, Münster, 1864. The *Lib. Pont.* purposely avoids any mention of the appointment of the kings to the Patriciate. Mabillon, also, *De re Dipl.*, ii. c. 3, 73, asserts that Stephen's investment of Pipin with the title of Patricius was merely honorary. The spurious deed of foundation of S. Silvestro in Capite (Giacchetti, *Hist. di S. Silvestro de Capite*, p. 16) bestows on Pipin the title, *Defensor Romanus*; at that time he would assuredly have been called *Defensor S. Dei Ecclesiae Romanae.*

that thou mayst see justice done to the Church of God and the poor; and of the office now conferred upon thee thou shalt render account to the Supreme Judge." The Emperor then invests the patrician with the mantle, places the ring on the forefinger of his right hand, gives him a written paper containing the words, "Be thou a merciful and upright Patricius," and having placed a golden circlet on his head dismisses him.[1] We cannot suppose that ceremonies such as these were observed on the occasion of Pipin's investiture. The same idea of the Patriciate, that of a supporter of the Church, floated before the mind of Stephen, although, in investing the Frank with the dignity, he strove to avoid conveying with it the direct authority over Rome which had been wielded by the Exarchs. Was it possible, however, that Pipin could be satisfied with a costly title without claiming the power with which in Byzantine times this title had been accompanied? This power had amounted to jurisdiction in Rome and the Exarchate, in the name of Emperor and Empire, and included, at the same time, the privilege of ratifying the papal election. The recognition of Pipin on the usurped throne of the Merovingians was but the reward for the war which he promised

[1] *Qualiter patricius sit faciendus.* Ozanam, *Docum. inédits*, &c., p. 182. The same formula is given by Ducange in the Glossary, from a Cod. Vatic. of Paul. Diaconus, *De Gest. Lang.*, and by Mabillon, *De re Dipl.*, c. ix. n. 3. Compare with this, Constant. Porphyrog., *De Cerimon. Aulae Byz.*, i. 47, p. 236. Later investigation attributes the formula to the age of the Ottos. Blume, *Rhein. Mus. für Jurispr.*, v. 123; Carl Hegel, &c., i. 316; and Giesebrecht, *Gesch. d. deutschen Kaiserzeit*, i. 812.

to conduct in behalf of the Pope in Italy. The Frankish prince undertook duties and acquired dignities; but duties soon developed into rights, and from an armed advocacy the Patriciate grew to be a power of supreme jurisdiction. The Popes, however, but reluctantly acquiesced in the change.

4. FRUITLESS NEGOTIATIONS WITH ASTOLF—STEPHEN'S RETURN—PIPIN COMES TO ITALY—ASTOLF ACCEPTS THE PROFFERED PEACE—PIPIN'S FIRST DEED OF GIFT, 754—THE LOMBARD KING ENTERS THE DUCHY—SIEGE OF ROME, 756—DEVASTATION OF THE CAMPAGNA—SACK OF THE ROMAN CATACOMBS—STEPHEN'S LETTER TO THE FRANKS—S. PETER'S TO THE KINGS OF THE FRANKS.

Astolf looked with annoyance on the action of the Pope and the Romans who had rejected him and made over the guardianship of Rome to the powerful King of the Franks. Even before Pipin, with his by no means willing nobles, set forth for Italy, the Lombard sought to thwart the plans of the Pope at the court of France. The monk Carloman was forced to leave Monte Casino, and go, as the envoy of Lombardy, to his brother Pipin, to try and induce him to break off his treaty with the Pope. The unfortunate monk expiated his dangerous commission by imprisonment in the monastery of Vienne, where he soon afterwards died.

After Pipin, at the Diet of Braisne, had received the consent of his nobles to his expedition, he departed for Italy, accompanied by the Pope, in

August 754. Stephen fervently hoped to attain his object without bloodshed, and while on their march he and Pipin sent messengers to Astolf, demanding the restitution of his conquests, and offering him a sum of money would he restore "the property to its owners." Happily, however, for the temporal aspirations of the Roman bishop, the Lombard declined the offer, and Pipin's memorable invasion—the first invasion of a Frankish King in an historic sense—was the result.

The Defender of the Pope crossed the passes of the Alps, routed the enemy at Susa, and laid siege to the capital, Pavia. Here the terror-stricken Astolf himself prayed for peace, and peace was immediately granted. He swore by a solemn oath to surrender Ravenna and other cities.[1] These events took place in the autumn of 754. For in so short a time had such great results been obtained; they prove, however, that the once formidable power of the Lombards was already shattered. Pipin now hastened back to France, leaving the Pope under the escort of his envoys, his natural brother Jerome, and the Abbot Folrad, to return to Rome. Arrived thither, Stephen was greeted by the exultant people as their saviour and deliverer.

It is only in the most general terms that Stephen's biographer tells us that Astolf had pledged himself

[1] See Pipin's first Italian war in L. Oelsner, p. 192, where a list of the cities is also given. The *Vita Steph.*, n. 248, says: *sub terribili sacramento, atque in eod. pacti foedere per scriptam paginam affirmavit, se illico redditurum civitatem Ravennatium cum aliis diversis civitatibus.*

to the surrender of Ravenna and other cities; nor does the historian seem to be aware of any previous donation to the Pope. Meanwhile, from two letters of Stephen, dating from the end of the year 754, it would appear that, after the declaration of peace in the autumn, Pipin had actually drawn up a deed of gift.[1] This written document formed the basis of the State of the Church, as founded by Pipin and Charles the Great. Its contents are, however, doubtful, since it does not appear whether the restitution of which it treated applied to the territories claimed by the Church or to the Greek provinces. Not a single syllable denotes that either Ravenna or the Exarchate were taken into consideration.

Pipin's deed of gift, 754.

It therefore follows that the document, by virtue of which the cities previously conquered by the Lombards were to be surrendered to the Pope, had really been executed. The official expression was "the restoration or restitution to the Republic of the Romans." Under this term the Empire in the abstract can no longer be understood, but only the Roman duchy, whose head the Pope had now become,[2] or, more correctly speaking, the Roman

[1] *Cod. Carol.*, vii., ix., in Cenni, vi., vii. The written deed of gift is undoubted: *et necesse est, ut ipsum Chirographum expleatis.* The expressions used for the surrender are: *reddere et contradere.* Pipin, therefore, made his first donation at this time, and not earlier at Ponthion or Kiersey.

[2] Döllinger, *Das Kaisertum Carl's d. Gr. und seiner Nachfolger* (*Münchner hist. Jahrb.*, 1865), maintains that the Pope referred the restitution to the national Italian or Roman republic, because the conquest of Ravenna under Justinian had been a usurpation. But in this case the Greek dominion generally, from the time of Belisarius, had also been a usurpation, and the fact that Stephen II. and his successors

Church, which, as a growing temporal power, diplomatically veiled itself behind the broad term "Respublica," borrowed from the ancient but still existing idea of the State.

Scarcely, however, had Pipin left Pavia when Astolf allowed himself to be persuaded into a violation of the treaty. Without surrendering a single town to the Pope, at the end of the year 755 he marched instead into the Roman duchy, anxious to punish the fox who had ventured to snatch the prey from the vengeance of the lion. Stephen found himself defenceless and in the utmost danger. He suspected the Franks of treachery, and addressed them a letter of remonstrance. The Latin of the document is barbarous and the style bombastic, as throughout the whole of the Carolingian collection; and the exaggerated epithets, "your mellifluous Grace," "mellifluous look and countenance," show how offensive were the courtly formulas of the age when the bombast of the Byzantine chancery was allied to the phraseology of the Bible.[1] With the honey, Stephen, however,

up to Charles recognised the Greek Emperor as the legitimate head of the Empire, even in Italy, would be an inexplicable contradiction. It were better to explain the phrase restitution on the ground that the giving back of the patrimonies occupied by the Lombards was extended to all the provinces, even those not belonging to the Pope, which were menaced by them. On the other hand, Genelin (*Das Schenkungs-Versprechen*) explains the term *reddere* by the assumption that the pretended donation of Constantine had been forged before the year 752, and had been made use of by Stephen II.

[1] *Vestra melliflua bonitas, vestris mellifluis obtutibus, nectareas mellifluasque regalis Excellentiae vestrae syllabas.* The summit of barbarism is reached in the expression *deifluo*, "flowing from God." The title *Christianissimus* is already a standing epithet of the Frankish King.

mingled bitter reproaches for Pipin's credulity, reminded the Frank that he had undertaken a dangerous journey to consecrate him King, that Peter had chosen him before all the princes of the earth as protector of the Church, and conjured him to see that the Apostle had his rights.[1] The letter was despatched to France, but in a short time Astolf stood before the walls of Rome.

Two hundred years had passed since Rome had endured its last tedious siege under Totila. All succeeding attacks of the Lombards had either been utterly unimportant or averted by the prompt payment of an indemnity. The King now appeared with the whole arriere-ban of the nation, summoned for the occasion, to make a last desperate attempt to conquer the city, and with it the crown of Italy. On January 1, 756, the Romans beheld the approach of the enemy, who came in three divisions, the Lombards of Tuscany by the Triumphal Way, the main division by the Salarian, and the Beneventans by the Via Latina.[2] In order to surround the city, Astolf encamped before the Salarian Gate and the Tuscans before the Portuensian, while the lines of the Beneventans stretched from the Lateran to S. Paul's.

Astolf besieges Rome, Jan. 1, 756.

The Lombards approached the walls, crying in derision to the Romans who manned them: "Let

[1] *Ut princeps Apostol. suam justitiam suscipiat*, an adroit phrase, embracing both legal title and possession.

[2] *Cod. Carol.*, iv., vi., Cenni, viii., ix. The Spoletans, who are not mentioned, were probably included in the *Tusciae partibus*. The chronology of this expedition of Astolf, as also of Pipin's second intervention, has been established by L. Oelsner, *Jahrb. des fränk. Reichs unter König Pipin*, p. 254, ff., and Excursus, p. 445, ff.

the Franks come and deliver you from our swords." The Romans answered by a resolute defence. The civic militia, already experienced in arms through various contests, gave honourable evidence of their patriotism. No Dux, or tribune, or any Roman leader is mentioned by name, but the sycophant Pope, in his letter to Pipin, bestows especial praise on the heroism of Werner, the Frankish abbot, who, in the capacity of envoy, still remained in the city. We may therefore assume that Werner, with a troop of soldiers as escort, had come to Rome, and that this troop now lent valuable aid in the defence.[1]

The ancient walls, which had been restored by Gregory III., withstood the battering machines of the Lombards; but the distress within the city increased day by day. The Campagna was ruthlessly laid waste by a vindictive enemy, and the colonies of the Church, scattered here and there over its surface, were levelled with the ground. Astolf, it is true, forbade any one to molest the basilicas of S. Peter and S. Paul, which lay within his territory, but all other churches outside the city were sacked, and the monks and nuns subjected to the roughest usage. The Lombards seemed to recall the Arianism of their forefathers. They showed no reverence for sacred things, but, on the contrary, treated them with open derision. Iconoclasts, probably Greek mercenaries in the army, destroyed the images of the saints, and made bonfires of their remains. At the same time—and no contrast more strikingly

Sacks the catacombs.

[1] *Praefatus vero Warneharius—ut bonus Athleta Christi decertavit totis suis viribus:* at the close of both letters.

illustrates the character of the century,—the same men who committed these outrages, instigated either by motives of piety or avarice, ransacked the churchyards for the bones of the sainted dead. The desire for these relics (a century later it became a positive epidemic) had long taken hold of the nation. In 722, Liutprand had bought the body of Augustine at a high price from the Saracens, and had it laid, amid the rejoicings of the people, in the Basilica of S. Petrus in Coelo aureo at Pavia. Astolf now utilised the siege of Rome to ransack the catacombs; and the city of the dead, on which some injuries had already been inflicted during the Gothic war, suffered a ruthless sack.[1]

The siege had already lasted fifty-five days when, on the 23rd February, Stephen, in order to hasten the expected aid from the Franks, sent the Abbot Werner with other envoys to Pipin. His letters reflect the desperate condition of the city. The first, addressed to the entire Frankish people, is couched in the name of the Pope, the clergy, and of all duces, chartulars, comites, tribunes, and the united Roman people and army; the second in his own. The Pope enforced the weight of his exhortations by a third

[1] *Pestifer Aistulfus—nam et multa corpora sanctorum effodiens, eorum sacra mysteria ad magnum animae suae detrimentum abstulit. Lib. Pont.*, n. 249. I quote, merely in passing, that in 653 Frankish monks had stolen the remains of Benedict and Scholastica from M. Casino, and had brought them to Gaul. Muratori, *Antiq. med. aevi.*, v. p. 6. The Roman catacombs, sacked by the Lombards, continued to be visited until the ninth century. Henceforward they remained unheeded until the fifteenth, when they must have been discovered anew. De Rossi, *Roma Sotterranea Cristiana*, Introduction.

The Apostle Peter writes a letter to the Franks.

letter, written in the name of the Prince of the Apostles himself. Neither the heresies of Arius or Nestorius, nor any of the other erroneous teachings which had menaced the Catholic religion in its innermost being, had called forth remonstrances from S. Peter; nor had the Apostle been stirred to any sign of displeasure, even when the irate Leo had threatened to destroy his statue. But with the immediate danger to his city and his patrimonies he was roused to action, and addressed a furious letter to his "adoptive sons," the Kings of the Franks. This remarkable invention constitutes one of the most authentic witnesses to the gross spirit which pervaded, not the century alone, but the Church itself—a spirit which did not shrink from employing the most sacred motives of religion in the cause of secular affairs.[1]

The Pope caused the Apostle to write as follows:—"Our Lady Mary, the ever-Virgin Mother of God, unites her entreaties to ours, protests, admonishes and commands, and with her the thrones and dominations and the entire army of the celestial host, as well as the martyrs and confessors of Christ, and all those who are acceptable to God. Together we exhort and conjure you to deliver not only the city of Rome entrusted to us by God, but the sheep of the Lord who dwell therein and are troubled, and the Holy Church which God has confided to me, from the hands of the persecuting Lombard; so that

[1] Fleury, *Hist. Eccl. an.* 755, n. xvii.: l'Eglise y signifie non l'assemblée des fidèles, mais les biens temporels consacrés à Dieu; le troupeau de Jésus-Christ sont les corps, et non pas les âmes—et les motifs les plus saints de la religion employés pour une affaire d'état.

(which may God avert) my body, for which the Lord Jesus Christ suffered, and my grave, where by God's command it rests, may neither be desecrated by them, nor the people belonging to me dispersed and killed by these Lombards; barbarians guilty of perjury and transgressors of God's word." After having descended to entreaties, the Apostle, at the close of the letter, rises to an angry tone, and utters threats of excommunication. "Should you, which we cannot believe, be guilty of delay or evasion, or fail to obey our exhortations in coming to the rescue of this, my city of Rome, its inhabitants, and the Apostolic Church, entrusted to me by God and its chief priest, know that, by the power of the Holy Trinity, by the grace of the Apostolic office confided to me by the Lord Christ, on account of your disobedience to my summons, you shall be declared to have forfeited the Kingdom of God and Eternal Life."[1]

5. PIPIN COMES TO ITALY—ASTOLF RAISES THE SIEGE OF ROME—ARRIVAL OF THE BYZANTINE ENVOYS—THEIR DISILLUSION—SUBMISSION OF ASTOLF—PIPIN'S DEED OF GIFT—FOUNDATION OF THE STATE OF THE CHURCH—DEATH OF ASTOLF, 756—DESIDERIUS RECOGNISED KING OF THE LOMBARDS—DEATH OF STEPHEN, 757.

The letter of the Apostle attained the desired end, and served Pipin as a plausible pretext for urging on his reluctant people a second invasion of Italy.

[1] *Cod. Carol.*, iii., Cenni, x.: *Petrus vocatus Apostolus a Jesu Christo Dei vivi filio . . . vobis viris excellentissimis Pippino, Carolo et Carolomanno tribus Regibus, atque sanctissimis Episcopis, Abbatibus,*

The curious device may have extorted a smile from the intellect of a King, even in an age so rude, but had Pipin remained unmoved by the threat of "his body and soul incurring everlasting Tartarean fires, in company with the devil and his angels," he dared not venture to expose S. Peter to the ridicule of the public.[1] His treaty with the Pope laid upon him, the Patricius of the Romans and Defender of the Church, the duty of protecting both city and Church by arms. He prepared for war, and the news of his departure obliged Astolf to raise the siege and hasten to the north to drive the Frank back from the frontiers of Italy. While Pipin approached the Alpine passes, three envoys of the Emperor Constantine V. entered Rome. Ignorant of the nature of the contract between Pipin and the Pope, the Emperor imagined that the Exarchate was to be restored to "the Roman Empire," and therefore sent his ministers to Rome, to claim the support of the Pope in behalf of his demands with the King of the Franks.

Astolf raises the siege.

The proud Emperor even hoped to entice the Franks into his service, and to make use of them against the Lombards, as Zeno had previously made use of the Ostrogoths against Odoacer. He undoubtedly hoped to persuade Pipin to join in an expedition against Astolf. Arrived in Rome, how-

*Presbyteris, vel cunctis generalibus exercitibus et populo Franciae.* The ancient reading in the *Lib. Pont.: subtili fictione Pipino—intimavit*, &c., can well be applied to this letter. Vignoli, however, corrects it: *subtili relatione*, &c.

[1] The letter contains the phrases: *Ne lanientur, et crucientur corpora, et animae vestrae in aeterno atque inextinguibili tartareo igne cum diabolo, et ejus pestiferis Angelis*, &c.

ever, his envoys were startled by the news that Pipin with his forces was approaching Italy for the second time. The Imperial envoys, accompanied by a Papal representative, promptly took ship, and heard in Massilia that the King had already crossed the Alps. Here they began to grasp the true state of affairs, and learnt that Pipin had been summoned by the Pope himself. Overcome with consternation, they sought to detain the Apostolic Nuncio.[1] Gregory, one of the Imperial ministers, mounting a swift horse, hastened in advance of him, overtook the Frankish army on the march to Pavia, and implored the King, after having reduced the Lombards to subjection, to restore the Exarchate and the remaining cities to their lawful owner. Pipin, however, unhesitatingly admitted that he had not undertaken either of his two expeditions on man's account, but solely out of devotion to S. Peter, and for the welfare of his soul; that not for all the treasures upon earth would he break his word to the Apostle, but, on the contrary, would surrender all the cities to S. Peter, the Roman Church, and the Pope. Astounded at these new political ideas, the Byzantine hastened to Rome, to lay before the Pope a vain protest against this monstrous infraction of the Imperial rights.[2]

Second expedition of Pipin into Italy, 756.

Astolf, meanwhile, for the second time shut up in

[1] We owe the revelation of these diplomatic secrets to two ingenuous sentences in the *Lib. Pont.*, n. 250.

[2] These occurrences are clearly related in the life of Stephen: *asserens isdem dei cultor, mitissimus Rex, nulla penitus ratione easdem civitates a potestate beati Petri et jure Ecclesiae Romanae, vel Pontificis Apostolicae Sedis quoquomodo alienari*, &c.

Pavia, lowered his arms in the autumn of 756. He was forced to become tributary to the Frankish King, obliged scrupulously to fulfil the earlier treaty, and also to add Comiaclum (Comacchio) to the towns restored. Stephen's biographer here, for the first time, tells us that Pipin executed a deed of gift (that of 754) in which the possession of the cities was ceded to the Roman Church and to all the Popes, and that this document was preserved to his time (the ninth century) among the archives of the Roman Church. This valuable document has disappeared, leaving no trace. No student has discovered the geographical or political boundaries of the donation. No one is able accurately to enumerate the towns, still less to define whether to the Pope was only given the *Dominium utile* in these districts, or whether he was invested with actual sovereignty.[1] The relations with Rome and the duchy, which are nowhere mentioned, remain obscure, and, since Pipin had not conquered the province, the donation could no more have applied to it than to the Greek cities of Naples or Gaeta. It cannot, however, be denied that Pipin did execute a deed of gift, and that, by virtue of conquest, he ceded to the Roman Church the cities of the Exarchate and Pentapolis, territories on which the Church possessed not the slightest claim.[2]

Donation of Pipin and foundation of the ecclesiastical State.

[1] Sugenheim holds that Pipin only ceded the *Dominium utile* to the Pope; Muratori, although undecided, inclines to the same opinion. Pagi bestows the absolute *dominium* on the Pope, as do Baronius, Borgia, Cenni, and Orsi. Le Cointe, de Meo, and de Marca assert the survival of Byzantine rule, and I, also, admit its existence as a theoretic principle at this time.

[2] The existence of Pipin's donation of the year 754 is confirmed by

Pipin wrested these Greek provinces from the Emperor, who had become incapable alike of recovering them from the Lombard and of retaining them. He bestowed them on the Bishop of Rome, not as upon a spiritual prince, or as on a sovereign who stood outside the power of the Empire, but as on the recognised head of the city of Rome and the Roman duchy. But since the Pope accepted this position solely as head of the Church, he received these territories in the name of the Roman Church and of its invisible head, S. Peter. He even concealed his usurpation behind the title of the Prince of the Apostles. If, to such a pretender, claims were opposed on the part of Byzantium, it was answered, with astute policy, that the supreme civil authority of the Emperor still continued to be recognised, and that in these territories the Pope only appeared as the Vicar of the Empire, or successor of the Exarch and Patricius of Ravenna. Nevertheless, the Imperial power was actually extinct; the provinces no longer either obeyed a Greek Viceroy or were subject to a Lombard King: they recognised the authority of the territorial dominion of the Pope, the most powerful man in Italy, already honoured with idolatrous reverence, and the head of the Latin nation.[1]

two already mentioned letters of Stephen, which speak of *donationis pagina* and *chirographum*. But of the gift of Venetia, Istria, Corsica, and Southern Italy there is not the slightest mention. The fact that, after the victory over the Lombard King, Pipin assigned only the Exarchate and some patrimonies in Lombard territory to the Pope, and that the Pope was satisfied with the donation, proves that the promises given did not extend any further.

[1] Döllinger rejects the opinion that Pipin founded a spiritual princi-

If far from Pipin lay the thought of deliberately founding an ecclesiastical State in the sense in which the champions of papal sovereignty desire to represent, he nevertheless invested the Pope with territorial rights over some of the fairest provinces of Italy, and thus became the founder of the later State of the Church, by means of which the unity of Italy was rendered impossible for long centuries to come. Here, where we have reached a fresh epoch in the history of the Church, considerations of another nature demand our attention. This sacred institution, the visible yet only spiritual community of the faithful, had framed itself on the lines of Roman Caesarism, and on the organisation of the Empire; and in the midst of the structure so created, the Bishop of Rome exercised in matters of religion the authority of a Caesar. Both Church and hierarchy

pality (see treatise already quoted). Philipps, *Kirchenrecht*, iii. 48, asserts, without foundation, that Pipin exalted the actual sovereignty of the Pope in the Exarchate to a *de jure* authority. Waitz, *Deutsche Verfass.*, iii. 81, says that the Roman bishop accepted Pipin's conquests for, and as the representative of, the Empire; at the same time, however, for the Church. Döllinger shares this opinion. We shall presently see how limited were the territorial rights, which Charles, as continuator of the work begun by Pipin, conceded to the Pope. The view of Eichhorn (*Deutsche Staats- und Rechtsgesch.*, 4 ed., i. 537), that to the Pope, as Patricius of Ravenna, was assigned the authority of the Exarch, is more admissible than his opinion that Pipin had already acquired this authority over Rome and the duchy. How little power he did exercise in these districts, following events will show. Savigny, *Gesch. d. Röm. Rechts*, i. 360, also gives to the Pope the power of Exarch; the donation, he thinks, was made to the Church and the Roman Republic, and by the republic is understood, not the city, but the ancient Western Roman Empire, which had been usurped by the Byzantine Emperors. The thought of its restoration had already been conceived.

had become penetrated throughout by the canons and policy of Imperialism. The power of the Pope was recognised in the matter of dogma; the primacy of the Apostolic chair had been established in the days of Leo I. and Gregory the Great. In the Iconoclastic contest it had obtained independence from the East, and the independence of the Church had found its political expression in the emancipation of Italy from Byzantium. The West separated from the East; and the Church, alienated from the Greek Emperor, allied herself with the great Catholic monarchy of the Franks, whose new royal dynasty she herself had consecrated. In this monarchy she foresaw the restoration of the Roman Empire, and the existence of the Frankish kingdom was a fortunate matter for Europe, preventing, as it did, the establishment of a western Caliphate in Rome. If the pontiffs of the eighth century could not rise to very lofty aspirations, yet, from the days of Gregory II. and Gregory III., they grasped the idea of giving a tangible foundation to their spiritual supremacy, and of making themselves masters of a part of Italy. The overthrow of the Western Empire, by which Rome became an entirely ecclesiastical city, the distance and powerlessness of the Byzantines, lastly the disruption of Italy, had left the bishops of Rome in possession of the field. The continuous energy of sagacious Popes now succeeded in giving a political existence to the Church, and creating a permanent ecclesiastical State. With the establishment of such a State, the purely episcopal and priestly, the greatest and most honourable period in the history of the

Roman Church came to an end. The Church now became more worldly; the Popes, who, contrary to the principles of the Gospel and the teaching of Christ, united royalty to the priesthood, could no longer retain unsullied the purity of the Apostolic office. The essentially contradictory nature of their twofold character drew them deeper and deeper into the vortex of political ambition, and they became of necessity involved in the demoralising struggle for the maintenance of their temporal title, in intestine strife with the citizens of Rome, and in lasting quarrels with political rivals. The successful foundation of an ecclesiastical State awoke a desire for possession in every other church; and, in the course of time, every abbey and bishopric wished to develop into an independent state of priests. Rome's example was zealously imitated, and deeds of gift suddenly sprang up in every direction.[1]

The King of the Franks commissioned the Abbot Folrad to execute the treaty; the Abbot went to the cities of the Pentapolis, the Aemilia, and the Exarchate, received their hostages, took their keys and deposited the latter in the shrine of S. Peter, with the documents drawn up by Pipin. Such were the events which suddenly gave an entirely new and material basis to the position of the Papacy, and exercised an influence so powerful on the history of Italy, and more particularly on that of Rome. With the year 756 a new period began in the inner and outer life of the city, into the form of which we shall presently enquire. Suffice it here to observe, that

[1] Witness, for example, the donations of Subiaco and Monte Casino.

although the severance of Rome from the Greek Empire had never been pronounced by any of the parties concerned in the transaction, the Pope had nevertheless obtained actual dominion over the city at the end of the year 756.

Meanwhile, the nature of the papal government in Rome was in no way monarchical. The city itself, at the time of the first beginnings of the *Dominium temporale*, asserted its communal privileges. While recognising the Pope as its *Dominus*, it preserved the rights of the Senate and people, and these found their best guarantee in the choice of the supreme head, the election of the Pope being the act of the entire people. The transference by the Romans to their bishop of the temporal power is lost in the twilight of history. We have no information with regard to any documental contract between the city and the Pope. Nor does any one tell us of that most memorable of all parliaments of the Roman people, when, assembled on the time-honoured Forum, *in tribus fatis*, they adopted the resolution of endowing the Bishop of Rome with the power of a Doge of the Republic. Nor do we even know whether this new authority bestowed upon the Pope was derived from a treaty dating from the time of Pipin. The mysterious origin of the Papal dominion is one of the most remarkable events of history, and the occupation of Rome by the alleged successors of Peter, silently accomplished under the eyes of the impotent successors of Constantine, a masterpiece of priestcraft. This valuable possession was worthy of the greatness of the Popes. The

successors of Stephen II. soon recognised, however, that it partook of the nature of Pandora's gift. For, since the foundation of the ecclesiastical State, the three rights on which it rested, namely, the ancient municipal right of the people, the ancient right of the Imperial monarchy, and the newly-acquired right of the Papacy, all of which had their roots in Rome, stood in continual strife. The history of the city is therefore for many centuries nothing more than the development of the strife of the three forces with and against one another.

Death of Astolf, 756.

Astolf did not long survive his humiliation. In the beginning of the year 757 Stephen was able to inform the King of the Franks that his relentless enemy was no more. This he did with the most exaggerated expressions of hatred and joy. "Astolf, that tyrant and associate of the devil, who swallowed the blood of the Christians and destroyed the Church of God, is pierced by the sword of God and thrust down into the gulf of hell, even now in the very days when but a year ago he was preparing to destroy the Roman city."[1] The unfortunate prince died, in consequence of a fall while hunting, towards the close of the year 756. The savage vindictiveness of the Pope pursued the dead even in the grave, since Astolf had failed to surrender several of the towns

[1] *Etenim tyrannus ille, sequax diaboli, Haistulphus devorator sanguinum Christianor., Ecclesiar. Dei destructor, divino ictu percussus est, et in inferni voraginem demersus . . . Cod. Carol.*, viii., Cenni, xi. Five hundred years later Innocent IV. rejoiced over the death of Frederick II., the great enemy of the Papacy, in similar words (*Laetentur coeli, et exultet terra*); so similar did priestly hatred and the position of Rome remain.

stipulated in the treaty, and Folrad, consequently, had only been able to deposit a portion of the keys in the shrine of the Apostle.

Desiderius King.

The Lombard army now undertook to dispose of the vacant throne, to which no heir could lay claim, and in March 757 proclaimed Desiderius, Duke of Tuscany, their King. No sooner, however, did the forgotten Rachis hear the news, than, breaking the vow that compelled him to lifelong renunciation in Monte Casino, he discarded the monastic habit, summoned the followers of his house, and placed himself at the head of an army. Desiderius knew of no better ally than the Pope, and offered Stephen not only a large sum of money as the price of the papal recognition of his succession to the Lombard throne, but also the cession of the cities Bologna, Imola, Ancona, Osimo, Faenza, and Ferrara, which had been withheld by Astolf, and still remained Lombard. Desiderius's proposal was joyfully accepted, and the treaty signed in Tuscany by Stephen's envoys, his brother Paul, Folrad, and Christopher. Rachis, crushed by the apostolic denunciations, again assumed the cowl. His party was weaker than that of Desiderius, which, in case of need, could have counted on the aid of the Roman army, backed by a band of Franks under Folrad. It appears that Folrad, the counsellor of Pipin, who, as his *Missus* or envoy, still lingered in Rome, must have had a retinue of Frankish soldiers, since the "school of Franks" settled in Rome could scarcely be meant by that band of warriors.[1] Desiderius ascended the throne in Pavia

[1] *Et praedictus Fulradus venerabilis cum aliquantis Francis in*

with the support of the Church, and the Pope hastened to occupy the cities ceded to him: Faenza, with the fortress Tiberianum, Gabellum, and the entire duchy of Ferrara, thus considerably "extending the boundaries of the Republic."[1] Stephen II. died soon after, at the summit of fortune, on April 24, 757. The Church, whether through accident, or a laudable self-consciousness, failed to award the nimbus, bestowed upon his predecessor Zacharias, to this astute priest, who might well, however, have exchanged his mitre for the less ethereal but substantial diadem of a temporal prince.

*auxilium ipsius Desiderii, sed et plures exercitus Romanorum si necessitas exigeret . . . Lib. Pont.*, n. 255.

[1] *Annuente Deo rempublicam dilatans . . . Lib. Pont.* In the *Cod. Carol.*, xxxvi., Cenni, xv. (p. 144), we read: *dilatationem huius provinciae*, which is the duchy; Rome and the duchy are called (*Cod. Carol.*, xx. c. xxxvii.) *haec miserrima et afflicta provincia.* Besides Imola and these cities Desiderius was also to give up Osimo, Ancona, Humana, Bononia. All these towns are absent from Pipin's donation in the *Lib. Pont.*, n. 254. They had remained Lombard.

## CHAPTER III.

1. Paul I., 757—Letters of the Romans to Pipin —Friendly Relations of the Pope to the King —Desiderius punishes the rebellious Dukes of Spoleto and Beneventum — Comes to Rome— Paul's Political Dealings—Relations of the Pope and the City to Byzantium—Peace with Desiderius.

While Stephen lay on his death-bed in the Lateran the impatient Romans were occupied in the election of his successor. One faction was in favour of the Archdeacon Theophylactus, another upheld the claims of the Deacon Paul, brother of the Pope. The former party was, it would seem, Byzantine, the latter Frankish in sympathies. The first wished to resume relations with the legitimate Imperial authority, the latter, which numbered the greater part of the Roman nobility, and to which the two brothers had probably themselves belonged, desired to adhere to the Frankish policy of Stephen. The man of modern ideas triumphed over the conservative, and, after a short resistance, Paul was elected, and ascended the Papal throne on May 29, 757, brother thus succeeding brother in the pontificate. The

Paul I. Pope, 757–767.

dangers which threatened the democratic nature of the papal election in a succession such as this, although transient, were renewed at a later time, when the barons of the Campagna lorded it over Rome.

Paul was the first of Roman bishops to occupy the sacerdotal chair in the character of territorial prince. Together with the already founded ecclesiastical State, he also, however, inherited the hostility of the Romans, who, awakening as from a state of stupefaction, recognised their oppressor in their bishop, and regarded him with feelings of hatred and opposition. Even before his consecration Paul notified his elevation to the Benefactor and Defender of the Church, "the new Moses and David," with the same forms of obsequious politeness observed by his predecessors in announcing their elections to the Exarchs.[1] It was thus for the first time recognised that the Frankish King had taken the place of the Exarch in relation to Rome. The position in which the newly-elected Pope found himself compelled him of necessity to assume an attitude of deference towards the powerful Patricius of the Romans, but by no means justified the assumption that the right of ratifying the papal election had been given to the King of the Franks. Paul wrote to Pipin in terms of anxious circumspection; and, although elected by the entire people, judged it prudent to detain Immo, Pipin's envoy, until after

[1] The ancient formula, with which it had hitherto been the custom to notify the election to the Exarch, was here throughout adhered to. The legal relation had been transferred from the East-Roman to the Frankish power. O. Lorenz, *Papstwahl und Kaisertum*, 1874, p. 31, f

the consecration, in order that the Franks might be convinced of the blamelessness and dependence on the Franks of both himself and the Roman people. He further assured the King that he and his people would remain faithful to him soul and body, until death.[1] Pipin in reply sent his congratulations, and soon after invited the Pope to stand godfather to his daughter Gisela. The forms of courtly intercourse were at the time rude and curious: the cutting of a lock of hair served as the symbol of adoption; the transmission of the swaddling bands of an infant candidate for baptism was a respectful intimation that the recipient was nominated sponsor. The Pope received the mark of royal favour with reverence, and laid the clothes of the little princess in the shrine of S. Petronilla.[2]

Among the documents addressed to the King of the Franks immediately after the papal election, was one of the highest importance. Pipin had written to the nobles and people of Rome, exhorting them to fidelity to S. Peter, the Church, and the Pope. In this letter the Roman people appear, for the first time in history, in the position of subjects of their bishop. Pipin's exhortations cannot, therefore, be regarded as an empty formula. They rather allow us to infer that a hostile movement had taken place among the Romans, associated probably with the divided election on the death of Stephen. Several powerful factions had moreover been formed among

[1] The first of Paul's thirty-one letters. *Cod. Car.*, xiii., Cenni, xii.

[2] *Cod. Carol.*, xxxi., Cenni, xiii.: *preciosissimum—munus attulit, Sabanum videlicet.*

the nobles in the city and neighbourhood, and both Lombards and Byzantines maintained adherents in Rome.

The Romans replied to the King in a letter, the purely clerical tone of which betrays its origin. The rough duces or comites of an age in which almost all diplomatic affairs were left in the hands of the clergy, undoubtedly entrusted some papal notary with the expression of their official sentiments. In reply to Pipin they said, or were made to say: "In truth, Lord King, the Spirit of God has found its dwelling in your mellifluous heart, since you are at pains to exhort our good disposition with such salutary counsel. Assuredly, most illustrious of kings, we remain true servants of the Holy Church, and of your thrice blessed and co-angelic spiritual Father, our Lord Paul, the most high Pontifex and universal Pope. The Pope himself is our Father and best Shepherd, striving daily, like his brother of blessed memory, for our welfare, and cherishing and beneficently governing us as a flock entrusted to him by God."[1] No voice of opposition to the prevailing loyalty with which the Pope was regarded makes itself heard in this letter. The Romans evidently recognised Paul as their ruler, and the King as his defender. Other reasons besides render the document remarkable. Its superscription runs:

[1] *Cod. Carol.*, xxxvi., Cenni, xv.: *nos—firmi, ac fideles servi S. Dei Ecclesiae, et praefati ter beatissimi, et coangelici spiritalis patris vestri, Domni nostri Pauli*, &c.,—*fovens nos, et salubriter gubernans*. . . . On the other hand, Pipin is only termed *noster post Deum defensor*, and *auxiliator*.

"To the illustrious and sublime Lord and the great Conqueror, appointed by God, Pipin, King of the Franks and Patricius of the Romans, from all the Senate and the whole Roman people, protected by God."[1] The name of the Senate again rises out of the long silence of history; we perceive, however, that it is no longer the ancient Curia of the Empire that is understood, but merely the civic nobility. The name of the Roman Senate reappears.

Paul's relations towards the King of the Franks were of the most friendly nature; messengers went to and fro, and frequent courtesies were interchanged.[2] During Paul's reign we even hear of a cardinal being appointed at the instance of a foreign prince. Pipin had begged the titular church of S. Chrysogonus for the presbyter Marinus, and Paul had acceded to the request.[3]

The King of the Lombards meanwhile kept the Pope at bay by promises of surrendering Bologna,

[1] *Domno excellentissimo, atque praecellent. et a Deo instituto magno victori Pippino Regi Francor., et Patricio Romanor., omnis Senatus, atque univ. populi generalitas a Deo servatae Romanae civitatis.* Muratori erroneously attributes the letter to the year 763.

[2] The Pope sent presents of books. *Antiphonale et Responsale—Grammaticam Aristotelis, Dionysii Areopagitae libros, Geometriam, Orthographiam, Grammaticam,* &c. *Cod. Carol.*, xxv., Cenni, xvi. 148. Paul sent Pipin a sword, the first instance of the consecration of a sword, and to the princes valuable rings. (*Cod. Carol.*, xv., Cenni, xviii. 159.) The sword signified Pipin's military mission. At later coronations the Pope took a naked sword from the altar of S. Peter, and girded it on the Emperor as Defensor of the Church and Miles of S. Peter. See formula in the *Ordo Roman.*, xiv., in Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.*, ii. 402.

[3] The cardinal afterwards conspired with Byzantium; the Pope implored the King to banish him as bishop to some city of his Empire. *Cod. Carol.*, xxv. and xxxix., Cenni, xvi. and xix.

Imola, Osimo, and Ancona ; promises which he never seriously meant to fulfil. He had, moreover, further cause for hostility in the fact that Stephen had incited the Dukes of Spoleto and Beneventum to revolt against their lawful sovereign, and induced them to place themselves under the protection of the King of the Franks.[1]

When, in 758, Desiderius took the field against these rebels, and advanced through the Pentapolis, sacking cities and districts, the Pope turned to Pipin in bitter indignation. Having overpowered and imprisoned Alboin of Spoleto, Desiderius advanced against Beneventum, whose duke, Liutprand, fled to his remotest city, Hydruntum on the Ionian Sea.[2] After the King had placed his vassal Arichis as Dux in Beneventum, he summoned George, the Imperial envoy, from Naples, and proposed an alliance, according to the terms of which the Emperor was to send an army into Italy, and the entire Lombard force was to join him in effecting the conquest of Ravenna, while a fleet from Sicily was at the same time to lay siege to Hydruntum.

Desiderius comes to Rome.

In spite of these negotiations Desiderius soon afterwards came to Rome. Paul had probably himself invited the King, in order to appease him with regard to his conduct concerning the two duchies, and in the hope of inducing him to surrender the four cities. Desiderius returned evasive answers to

[1] This is evident from Paul's letters. *Cod. Carol.*, xv., Cenni, xviii.: *sicque Spoletinum et Beneventanum, qui se sub vestra a Deo servata potestate contulerant.*

[2] This city was already known as Otorantum (Otranto).

all the Papal demands ; he required first the delivery of the hostages whom Astolf had been obliged to send to France. The Pope feigned acquiescence, and gave his messenger an open letter for Pipin, in which, while expressing a fulsome recognition of his "illustrious son Desiderius," he implored the release of the hostages.[1] In a second and private letter, however, he explained the contents of the first, complained of the devastations inflicted on the Pentapolis, informed Pipin of the negotiations with the Greeks, and entreated him to retain the hostages.[2] These candid avowals on the part of Paul, provoking, as they do, the question whether any circumstances can justify the Pope in the utterance of a falsehood, may perplex the judgment of austere Christians. The lofty moral code of the Apostle would have forbidden all doubt on the subject. The facts just related further serve to show how dangerous was the attitude of opposition, in which, owing to his temporal position, the Roman bishop was now placed with regard to his spiritual office.

Desiderius continued to retain possession of the cities, and even to occupy the ecclesiastical patrimonies ; Paul to send his complaints to Pipin until, by means of the Frankish envoys, Remigius and Authar, a treaty was effected in March 760. The Lombard King promised to restore all the patrimonies and towns of the Roman Republic; he

[1] See this letter in the *Cod. Carol.*, xix., Cenni, xvii.

[2] Letter xv., Cenni, xviii. : *sed bone Excellentissime fili, et spiritalis compater, ideo istas literas tali modo exaravimus, ut ipsi nostri missi ad vos Franciam valerent transire.*

actually kept his promise with regard to some of the towns, but retained possession of Imola.[1] The ground of dispute still remained, although the relations between the two powers became more friendly than before. Meanwhile, the attitude of the Pope towards the Emperors Constantine and Leo was of the most curious description. While sending Nuncios to try and prevail on the Emperors to restore image-worship, he is entirely silent concerning the differences with regard to the Exarchate or Rome. Even in a letter to Pipin, the Pope explains "the Greeks persecute us for no other cause than our orthodox faith and the pious traditions of the Fathers, which they seek to destroy."[2] This statement justifies the doubt as to whether the Emperor had actually been deprived of his authority in Rome, since, had the Pope attained absolute power, it would appear more natural to have attributed the Imperial displeasure to the separation of the duchy and Exarchate.[3] The Popes continued in diplomas to admit the Emperor's supremacy; but, as a matter of fact, the Emperor neither received tribute from the Roman province nor did any Byzantine official any longer exercise authority in the city.

Relations of the Pope to the Emperors.

[1] See, with reference to this, Letter xxi., Cenni, xx.; instead of the year 759, Muratori holds it to have been 760, and the 13 Ind. Troya holds the same opinion, *Cod. Dipl. Long.*, tom. v. n. dccxl.

[2] *Non ob aliud nefandissimi nos persequuntur Graeci, nisi propter sanctam et orthodoxam fidem*, &c. *Cod. Carol.*, xxxiv., Cenni, xxv.

[3] Muratori (*Annal. ad Ann.* 759–762) is surprised that Paul speaks of the preparations of the Byzantines only against Ravenna, never against Rome. However, the *Cod. Carol.*, xxxiv., Cenni, xxv., says: *Graeci—super nos, et Ravennatium partes irruere cupiunt.*

Rome as well as Ravenna had been wrested from the hands of the Emperor, who was forced to await a favourable opportunity for the recovery of his lost possessions. Rome was, however, distant, and protected from attacks from Naples by friendly Beneventum, but Ravenna, of greater importance on account of its position, was nearer of access and more easy to conquer. In 761 reports of a hostile design became current. The Pope, therefore, called upon Pipin to intercede with Desiderius, so that the Lombard would yield help in case of need. He further commanded the Dukes of Benevento and Spoleto, as his neighbours, to rise in his support, which proves that the Pope not only feared for Rome itself, but also that peace subsisted with Desiderius, and that the Dukes obeyed the authority of the Lombard King. The Emperor sought in vain to win the Archbishop of Ravenna to his side. Sergius, previously kept in custody by Pope Stephen, but reinstated in his office by Paul, hastened to send the Imperial letter to Rome.[1] The preparations of the Greeks were discontinued; no opportunity for a military expedition against Italy could be less favourable than while peace endured with the Lombards.

Paul I. had no further cause to dread the threats of Byzantium. Only once again does he mention the Greeks. In a letter to Pipin he writes that he had heard that six patricians, with three hundred ships and the Sicilian fleet, were on their way from Constantinople to Rome; that he was ignorant of

[1] Letter xxviii., Cenni, xxvi. and xxiv., Cenni, xxxviii., deal with the intentions of the Byzantines.

the object of the expedition, but had been informed that the fleet had orders to come first to Rome, and thence proceed to France.[1] The indifference with which the Pope speaks of the expedition would excite surprise, even had Rome remained on the most friendly terms with Constantinople. It is evident that Paul treated the report as an idle rumour, and, indeed, the six patricians, no less than the immense number of vessels, may well appear fabulous. The Greeks made no attempt to reconquer Italy by force, and the Pope might have slept undisturbed in the Lateran Palace, but for an occasional outbreak on the part of Desiderius. Pipin was assailed by further complaints; and long negotiations concerning the patrimonies, mutual demands, indemnities, and limitations of frontiers were dragged on by the representatives of the three powers until 764 or 765, when, on the restoration of the town of Imola, peace was secured to the Church.

### 2. Buildings of Stephen II. and Paul I.—The Vatican and S. Peter's—The first Belfry in Rome—The Chapel of S. Petronilla—Removal of the Saint from the Catacombs to the City—Foundation of the Convent of S. Silvestro in Capite.

We have hitherto followed Paul's political career, and must now dedicate a few pages to the buildings which he and his brother erected in the city.

[1] *Quod sex Patricii deferentes secum trecenta navigia, simulque et Siciliensem stolum, in hanc Romanam urbem absoluti a Regia Urbe ad nos properant. Ibid.*

Buildings of Stephen II. in the Vatican

Stephen II. had restored the Basilica of S. Lawrence, and founded a considerable number of houses for pilgrims. Above all, he had added to the Vatican, which had now increased to the proportions of a suburb. The Basilica of the Prince of the Apostles was surrounded by chapels or smaller churches, episcopiae, houses for pilgrims, mausoleums, convents, and a colony composed of every class of people, who here found occupation and means of subsistence. As early as the days of Gregory III. the district had possessed three monasteries, SS. John and Paul, S. Martin, and a third of yet earlier date, dedicated to the elder Stephen, and which bore the surname Cata-Galla-Patritia.[1] Stephen II. added a fourth monastery, apparently S. Tecla, or Jerusalem, and also built a bell-tower to the atrium of the basilica, overlaying this tower, the first of the kind in Rome, with silver and gold.[2] To the eighth

[1] *Lib. Pont.*, "Vita Gregor. III.," n. 194. Panvin, *De Basil. Vat.*, iii. c. 8 (tom. ix., "Spicileg. Roman."), gives the names of the convents from a marble tablet of Gregory III. from the oratory of this Pope. De Rossi, *Due Docum. inediti Tavola*, ii.; Cancellieri, *De Secretariis novae B. Vat.*, p. 1484. The name *Cata Galla Patricia* is derived from a piece of ground belonging to Galla, daughter of the Patricius Symmachus, who dwelt as a nun beside S. Peter's. The barbarous *Chron. Benedicti* of Soracte says of her: *ad omnipotentes Dei servitium sese apud b. Petri ap. ecclesia in monasterio tradidit.*

[2] Stephen built it in gratitude for the successful issue of his journey to Pipin. Frodoard, "De Stephano II." (*Dom. Bouquet*, v. 442): *Papa . . . turrim erigit aulae, Argentique colens radiis investit et auri. Aere tubas fuso attollit, quibus agmina plebis Admoneat laudes et vota referre Tonantis.* The earliest use of church-bells is ascribed to Paulinus of Nola. Baronius, *ad Ann.* 614. Audoen, *Vita S. Eligii*, anno 650, speaks of Campanae; similarly, Bede, about 700. The phrase was: *signa pulsare ad missam publicam.* Bells were in common

century apparently belongs the origin of the custom of building belfries close to the basilica. These were square, of the same proportions from base to summit, had arched windows and tiny pillars, such as the campaniles of later date, of which numerous examples still survive in Rome. With the construction of the tower, the original idea of the ancient basilica was abandoned, and a sudden stride made towards the Romanesque style of the feudal period, to which the tower more especially belongs. The tower was further adopted in convents and Churches, partly from the necessity for defence.[1]

Chapel of S. Petronilla.

Stephen also built a chapel beside S. Peter's, which he dedicated to Petronilla, who is said to have been the legitimate daughter of the Apostle Peter.[2] The remains of the saint had been buried in the cemetery situated on the Via Ardeatina, formerly known as that of Domitilla, wife of Flavius Clemens. The same burial-place contained also the ashes of Nereus and Achilleus, saints who had received baptism at the hands of the Apostle. These catacombs, the original burial-place of the Christian branch of the Flavian family, also bore the name of

use among monks from the year 740 onwards. Joh. Bapt. Casali, *De profan. et sacris veterib. Ritibus*, Romae, 1644, p. 236.

[1] The "Cod. Freher. and Thuan II." of the *Lib. Pontif.* speak of the belfry of Stephen.

[2] Tertullian and Jerome speak of his wife. De Rossi holds Petronilla to have been the spiritual daughter of the Apostle, and derives her name from that of Flavius Petronius. *Bull. d. Arch. crist.*, 1874, p. 9. According to legend, Flavius, a noble Pagan, desired the beautiful maiden in marriage. She requested three days for consideration, prayed, and died.

Petronilla.[1] At the end of the fourth century, Bishop Siricius had built here a basilica to the saint, a church which recent times have brought to light. Stephen II., wishing to remove her remains to the Vatican, dedicated a sumptuous chapel to Petronilla near the basilica; for since Andrew, the brother of Peter, already possessed a chapel in the Vatican, it was decided that the various members of the family should rest side by side. The chapel was constructed in the circular building in which Honorius had previously erected the mausoleum for himself and his wives, Maria and Thermantia.[2] The ruinous structure was transformed into a chapel by Stephen, and its interior decorations were finished under Paul I. During the changes thus effected, the sarcophagi of Honorius, Valentinian III., and other members of the house of Theodosius, were bricked up and hidden by masonry; and it was only after some centuries that they were accidentally again brought to light, without, however, being noticed and scientifically investigated.[3]

[1] With regard to the cemetery of Petronilla, see Boldetti, *Osservaz. sopra i Cimeteri de' SS. Martiri.*, ii. c. 18, 551. De Rossi, *Bull.*, 1874, 1876, has described this cemetery, excavated since the year 1854. Miraculous oil from the lamp of S. Petronilla is spoken of as early as 600; in the list of such oils given by Marini, *Papiri*, &c., p. 208, we find *Sce Petronillae filiae Scti Petri Apost.* . . .

[2] The name of the place is corrupted in the *Lib. Pont.* to Mosileos; in the time of Odoacer a Synod was held in Mausoleo, *quod est ap. b. Petrum. ap.* A. Thiel, *Ep. R. Pont.*, i. 685. Cancellieri, *De secretar. Veter. B. Vat.*, has devoted a lengthy dissertation to the round church of Petronilla.

[3] Sarcophagi here were discovered in 1458 and 1519, and in 1544 the graves of the Empresses Maria and Thermantia. The gold orna-

The sanctuary of S. Petronilla was founded in honour of Pipin, the adoptive son of the Church or S. Peter; on which account the kings of France down to modern times have remained patrons of the chapel.[1] There the supposed body of the saint was deposited, when, after the sack of the catacombs by the Lombards, Paul had the remains of the dead, for their more effectual protection, removed wholesale into the city and distributed amid various churches and convents. This, together with the continued spoliation of the catacombs, explains the empty state in which the cemeteries of early Christianity were discovered when excavated afresh in after ages. The translation of the dead of Rome produced a great sensation throughout the world, for the possession of such relics was esteemed of priceless value. As, after the beginning of the nineteenth century, all the principal museums in Europe strove to obtain mummies from Egypt, so in the eighth every town and church in Christendom coveted the remains of martyrs from the Roman catacombs; and England, France, and Germany sent envoys to beg for such treasures. The ashes of Romans of every condition, age, and character were transported to the furthest wilds of Germany, and there reverently laid beneath the altars of monasteries in those distant forests, where the remains of the warriors

ments therein contained were stolen and melted. De Rossi, "Il mausoleo imperiale nel Vaticano . . . ." *Bull.*, 1878, p. 139, f.

[1] *Infra autem sacrati corporis auxiliatricis vestrae B. Petronillae, quae pro laude aeterna memoriae nominis vestri nunc dedicata dinoscitur. Cod. Carol.*, xxvii., Cenni, viii. Why the Franks accorded such honour to Petronilla in particular remains unexplained.

of Varus and Drusus had ages before mouldered into dust.

Paul I. builds the monastery of S. Silvestro in Capite, 761.

In 761 Paul founded the still existing monastery of S. Silvestro in Capite, in the fourth region. In olden times, this quarter of the city had belonged to the seventh region (Via Lata), and was partly occupied by the Gardens of Lucullus, traversed by the Aqua Virgo.[1] Here stood the ancestral house of Paul; here his brother had already founded a monastery, dedicated (either from motives of gratitude to Pipin, or from the fact that he himself had lodged in the convent of S. Denis while in Paris) to Denis, the Frankish saint. Paul I. completed the building begun by his brother, and dedicated it to Popes Stephen and Sylvester, and also, as it would appear, to S. Denis,[2] and installed Greek monks within the monastery.[3]

[1] Benedict of Soracte, in the tenth century, thus describes the spot; *Stephanus—cepit hedificare domum ecclesiam; in onore S. Dionisii, Rustici et Heleutherii, in hurbe Roma, juxta via Flaminea et ereio* (horologium of Augustus?), *non longe ab Agusto, juxta formas species decorata, sicut in Francia viderat. Mon. Germ.*, v. c. 20. *Agusto* is the mausoleum of Augustus. I lay weight upon the fact that Benedict associated the foundation of Stephen with his sojourn in France.

[2] It is called *Monaster. SS. Christi martirum Stephani et Silvestri atque Dionisii* in the Bull of Sergius II. This Bull, which is, however, undoubtedly forged, and belongs to about the year 844, confirms the monastery in the possession of some properties, among others, the Porta Valentini (del Popolo) with its tolls, and the *pons lapideus qui appellatur in Olivium* (a corruption of Molvius). Pflugk-Hartung, *Acta Pont. R. ined.*, ii. n. 56.

[3] *Ubi et Monachorum congregationem construens, Graecae modulationis psalmodiae Coenobium esse decrevit. Lib. Pont.*, "Vita Pauli," n. 260. The diploma of foundation, a doubtful parchment, reproduced in Labbé, *Conc.*, viii. 445, is preserved among the

It was not until the thirteenth century that the church was named *in Capite*. For here at this time the head of John the Baptist, after protracted wanderings, during which it had liberally disposed of portions of itself over the various countries of earth, was at last laid to rest.[1]

3. Death of Paul I., 767—Usurpation of the Dux Toto—The Pseudo-Pope Constantine—Counter-revolution in Rome—Christophorus and Sergius, with the aid of the Lombards, surprise the City—The Lombards install Philip in the Lateran—Stephen III.—Terrorism in Rome—Punishment of the Usurpers—Death of Pipin, 768—Lateran Council, 769.

Paul I. is described by his biographer as a man of mild disposition and amiable character.[2] Nevertheless, the tumultuous scenes amid which his latest hours were spent, and which continued after his death, prove that, as temporal ruler of the city, he

Archives of S. Silvestro. For a detailed but uncritical history of this church, see Carletti, *Memorie Storiche critiche*, Rome, 1795.

[1] It was also called Cata Pauli, that is to say, *ad Pauli domum*; also, *inter duos hortos*. The *Lib. Pont.* ascribes to Paul the building of a church, dedicated to the Apostles Peter and Paul, near the Temple of Roma, on the Via Sacra. It must have stood on the spot where the present S. Francesca Romana stands, amid the ruins of the Temple of Venus and Rome.

[2] It was said in praise of Paul I. that he visited the prisons at night, in order to liberate the criminals condemned to death; a proof that the right of pardon belonged to the Pope. *Et si quos ibidem conveniebat retrusos a mortis eruens periculo liberos relaxabat. Lib. Pont.*, n. 258. He frequently purchased the release of debtors, *a jugo servitii*; the law against debt then still prevailed.

was not popular. These disturbances were, however, the consequences of the altered position of the Papacy towards the city. As soon as the Papacy had assumed a temporal form, and the political connection with the Greek Empire had been severed, municipal instincts awoke as from a long sleep. With the arms which the Romans seized to defend themselves against Lombards and Greeks, they grasped the consciousness of power, and the desire for political autonomy began to assert itself. Henceforward we have a history of the aristocracy in the Roman Republic; and to this period the inner feuds of the city, the struggles of the Papacy with the nobles, owe their origin. The Popes, incapable of ruling the city, soon found themselves obliged to bestow a new Emperor on reluctant Rome. The value of the Papacy rose in the eyes of the Roman nobles now that it was united with a temporal principality, and the optimates, who exercised a decisive influence in the papal elections, strove henceforth to obtain the elevation of members of their own families.

The Pope lay on his death-bed in the monastery of S. Paul without the walls, and scarcely had the news reached the ears of the people, when a wild tumult broke out in the city. A powerful patrician party, resolved to attain their own ambitious ends, was headed by Toto, who, it would appear, was Dux in Nepi. He was the owner of extensive property and a numerous and useful tenantry in Tuscan territory, and also of a palace in Rome. Many palaces in the city were of ancient date, and monuments of past

The Dux Toto overpowers the city,

ages, and memories of their former owners, the Cethegi, Decii, Probi, Symmachi, Maximi, centring perhaps round some ancient statue, probably still survived as household legends. The palaces themselves had outlived the metamorphosis of Rome, and had in some cases been converted into monasteries and hospitals, in others, to fortress-like dwellings, where some uncouth family of doubtful ancestry had made its home.

Before the Pope was yet dead, Toto, with his brothers Constantine, Passivus, and Paschalis, and followed by an armed retinue, hurriedly left Nepi and forced an entrance by the gate of San Pancrazio into Rome, where he entrenched himself within his palace. The Pope died on June 28, 767, shamefully abandoned by his entire household; Stephen, a presbyter or cardinal, alone remained faithful to the last.[1] The day following, Toto caused his brother Constantine to be proclaimed Pope, and conducted him, amid the clang of arms, to the Lateran. The uproarious election could only have been accomplished by a faction formed by these nobles among the Roman clergy. Their names are partly Latin, partly Byzantine.[2] The audacity of the usurpation was increased by the circumstance that Constantine was a layman; Toto, however, compelled George, bishop of Praeneste, to transform his brother into a cleric, and after ordination to consecrate him

and raises his brother Constantine to the Papacy.

[1] *Omnes eum derelinquentes, nisi ego;* so said Stephen III. in the *Concil. Lateran*, a. 769, ed. Cenni, Rome, p. 4.

[2] The name Toto is Latin, an abbreviation common in Italy at the present day for that of Antonio.

successively sub-deacon and deacon. Never was a transformation more quickly accomplished. The Romans, terror-stricken by the arms of his brother, tendered the oath of fidelity to the newly-elected Pope, who entered S. Peter's on Sunday, July 5, and there received ordination at the hands of George and of the Bishops Eustratius of Albano and Citonatus of Portus.

Thus did a tonsured landowner obtain possession of the papal throne, which he succeeded in retaining for a year. No one ventured to interfere with the violent usurpation. Nothing is told us of any protest being raised by the Frankish representatives. The fact that an envoy of the Franks, who was in Rome at this time, quietly departed for France as the bearer of Constantine's first letter, and, further, that such envoys only appeared from time to time in Rome, and frequently at the request of the Pope, seems, on the contrary, to show that the King of the Franks and Patricius of the Romans did not as yet exercise any direct sovereign authority within the city. During the whole period of usurpation nothing is heard of any interference on the part of Pipin, or of the arrival of any plenipotentiary. The Roman factions, and more especially the dignitaries of the papal palace, alone appear to have taken any part in the drama.[1]

[1] Besides the *Lib. Pont.*, a fragment of the *Acts of the Lateran Council* of the year 767, edited by Gaetano Cenni, and given in full in Mansi's *Suppl. Concil.*, i. 642, is valuable as an authority for these events. Of Toto it is said: *quidam Nempesini oppidi ortus Toto nomine.* We are not enlightened with regard to either the man or the circumstances. To connect this Dux with a Vallis de Toto near

The usurper had, however, no sooner taken his seat on the papal chair than he found it necessary to gain Pipin's good-will. To him, as Patricius of the Romans, Constantine announced his elevation as his predecessor had done, and begged Pipin to continue the protectorate of Rome, assuring him that he, the Pope, would remain faithfully devoted to the Defender of the Church. He further informed Pipin that on the death of Paul he had been elected Pope by the Romans and people of the neighbouring towns, but he was silent regarding the circumstances of his elevation. Pipin returned no answer, and Constantine despatched a second letter. The unfortunate puppet of a brother who had given him the tonsure in order himself to reign in Rome, doubtless heaved many an anxious sigh. It was a half truth and the presentiment of his fall when he wrote, "that he had been hurled to the awful height of the Papacy by violence, as if by an innumerable and unanimous crowd."[1] He renewed, as in duty bound, the expressions of obsequious greeting, and implored the King not to give ear to his slanderers. No tidings reach us of any answer from Pipin.

Christophorus and Sergius

The reaction against these despotic proceedings was headed by the foremost officials of the Church. Christophorus, who, under Paul, had been Primicerius

Sutri of a later time is a very hazardous conjecture. Tomassetti, *Arch. d. Soc. Romana*, 1882, v. 622.

[1] *Ex improvisa enim violentia, manu a populorum innumerabili concordantium multitudine, velut valida aura venti raptus, ad tam magnum et terribile Pontificatus culmen provectus sum. Unde sicut navis aequoreis procellis fluctuatur, ita ego infelix*, &c. Both letters of Constantine in the *Cod. Carol.*, 98, 99.

of the Notaries and Consiliar, that is to say, in modern terms, Chief Chancellor or Secretary of State, after having in vain resisted the usurpation, had fled with his sons for refuge to the high altar in S. Peter's, where Constantine had sworn to grant him his life and permission to dwell in his house until Easter.[1] Christophorus was the principal dignitary in Rome. On him the management of the Church devolved during the vacancy of the papal chair, while his son Sergius filled the important office of Sacellarius or Sacristan. Together with other Romans, these two men swore the overthrow of the usurper. They feigned a desire for the monastic life, and Constantine, delighted to be rid of them, or trusting to their oath, granted them permission to leave Rome and retire to the monastery of S. Salvator, near Rieti. Instead, they hastened to Theodicius, Duke of Spoleto, and were accompanied by him to Pavia.

demand the help of Desiderius.

Desiderius lent a willing ear to the complaints of the exiles; he expressed his readiness to lend them arms for the conquest of Rome, but, in return for his promised aid, imposed conditions, to which they assented. He gave them the presbyter Waldipert as companion, in the secret hope that Waldipert would promote his interests, and, accompanied by a Lombard army, Sergius and Waldipert set forth for Rome. On July 28, 768, they occupied the Salarian Bridge; the following morning they advanced across the Milvian and pushed forward to the Pancratian Gate. The sentry, whose adhesion had been

[1] See the already quoted *Acts of the Council* of the year 769.

gained by the conspirators, allowed them to enter, but the Lombards, faint-hearted, would not venture to descend the Janiculum.[1] On the cry that enemies were within the city, Toto and Passivus, with the Secundicerius Demetrius and the Chartular Gratiosus, fellow-conspirators and traitors, hastened to the gate. Rachimpert, a gigantic soldier, attacked Toto, but was felled by the mighty blows of the duke. The Lombards who beheld his fall took to flight, at the moment when Toto sank, pierced by the lances of the two conspirators. Now that their cause was lost, Passivus flew to the Lateran to save his brother. Passivus, Constantine, and his Vicedominus, Bishop Theodore, sought refuge together in the basilica, where they shut themselves up within the oratory of S. Caesarius, and remained for hours sitting by the altar; the palace meanwhile resounding with the shouts of the searchers and the din of arms. The fugitives were at length seized and thrown into prison.

Fall of Toto and Constantine, 768.

In the midst of the tumult, and without the knowledge of Sergius, Waldipert assembled the Lombard faction existing among the Romans. This faction was in the pay of Desiderius, and by its means Waldipert hoped to procure the election of a Pope devoted to his interests. Going to the monastery of S. Vitus on the Esquiline, he brought forth the presbyter Philip, and the astounded Romans beheld a new Pope conducted to the Lateran, and heard

Waldipert attempts to place a Lombard on the papal chair.

[1] *Per muros civitatis cum flammula ascendebant, metuentes Romanum populum, et nequaquan de Janiculo ipsi Longobardi ausi sunt descendere. Lib. Pont.*, n. 268. The flammula, says Vignoli, was a reddish-purple banner; it reminds us of the French oriflamme.

the shouts of the Lombards: "Philip, Pope, S. Peter has chosen him." A bishop was found in the Lateran to consecrate Philip, and the newly-elected pontiff took his seat on the papal chair, gave the people the benediction, and, according to usage, held the solemn banquet, at which the dignitaries of the Church and optimates of the militia were present. In the meantime, unfortunately for Philip, the Primicerius Christophorus, whose coming had, for some unexplained reason, hitherto been delayed, arrived. The Roman party immediately flew to arms; and their leader, the Chartular Gratiosus, forced the usurper to return to his cloister.

Christophorus raises Stephen III. to the Papacy, 767–772.

The following day (August 1) Christophorus, in his capacity of papal representative during the vacancy of the sacred chair, summoned clergy and people. The place of meeting was again the spot *in tribus fatis* on the ancient Forum, a site which, in the last days of the Empire, had been occasionally reanimated by the assemblies of the people.[1] The Primicerius here put forward the presbyter Stephen as candidate for the Papacy. This cardinal, son of the Sicilian Olivus, had been one of Paul's staunchest adherents and the sole attendant who remained by the death-bed of the Pope. He was now unanimously summoned from his titular church, S. Cecilia in Trastevere, and proclaimed in the Lateran as Stephen III.[2]

[1] *Sicque praefatus Christophorus alia die aggregans in tribus fatis sacerdotes, ac primates cleri, et optimates militiae, atque universum exercitum, et cives honestos, omnisque populi Roman. coetum a magno usque ad parvum.* N. 271.

[2] Stephen III. was elected on August 1st, and consecrated on the 7th. Jaffé.

Barbarous punishment of the usurpers.

The state of barbarism into which Rome had fallen showed itself in wild scenes of fanatical revenge. The imprisoned cardinals and bishops were deprived of their eyes and tongues; the usurper Constantine was led in derision through the city and taken to the monastery of Cellanova on the Aventine.[1] A Synod deposed him on the 6th of August, and ordained Stephen in his stead.

Gratiosus, the murderer of Toto, subsequently rewarded with the dignity of Dux, either of the army or of some city, with his armed followers now vented his fury against all the adherents of the defeated faction.[2] One of these, the tribune Gracilis in Alatri (military tribunes existed in the country towns), defended himself within the primeval Cyclopean walls which surrounded this strong city, until it was taken by assault.[3] The inhabitants of this Latin

[1] *Nam Constantinus invasor ap. Sedis, dum deductus ad medium esset, et magna pondera in ejus adhibentes pedibus in sella muliebri sedere super equum fecerunt, et in Monasterium Cella novas coram omnibus deportatus est. Lib. Pont.*, in Stephano, n. 272. According to the *Catalogus Magnus Ecclesiar.*, this monastery of Greek monks stood near the church of S. Saba; the district was called Cella Nova; and there in former days the mother of Gregory the Great had owned a house.

[2] *Gratiosus tunc Chartularius postmodum dux.* N. 269.

[3] In the manuscript D. in Muratori: *et Campaniae pergentem Alatro partem Campaniae ubi erat*, according to the conjecture of Papencordt, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter*, p. 93. When coming to the end of this (the second) volume of my work in 1858, the materials left by Papencordt, and edited by Höfler under the above title, came to my hands. Papencordt's thoroughness gave promise of an important work, had he been content to restrict himself to the political aspect of affairs. He died, however, in the beginning of his career. To him belongs the honour of having been the first to cope with this difficult undertaking. The scheme of his work was unknown to me when, in 1855, I conceived and began my own.

mountain district hastened to Rome, dragged the tribune from his prison, and put out his eyes.[1] Gratiosus soon after forced an entrance into the monastery of Cellanova, where, with similar savagery, Constantine was mutilated in the Byzantine manner.

The vengeance of the Romans was now directed against the Lombard Waldipert, who, in spite of the fact of having aided in the overthrow of Constantine, had placed Philip on the papal throne, and, it was rumoured, intended to betray Rome to the Duke of Spoleto. In vain he clung to the statue of a saint in the Pantheon, whither he had fled for safety. He was thrown into a hideous dungeon and cruelly put to death.[2]

Stephen III. turns to the Franks.

Amid horrors such as these, which he did not seek to prevent, Stephen III. entered on his short pontificate. He had been elected in opposition to the aims of Desiderius, and remained at open variance with the Lombard King. He turned, therefore, unhesitatingly to the Frankish princes, and requested them to send bishops from their country to Rome, where he must hold a council. Sergius, now Secundicerius, was himself the bearer of the papal letter, but on his arrival in France he found that Pipin was no longer numbered among the living. The renowned prince had died on September 24, 768, and his kingdom had been divided between his two sons.

[1] Near the Colosseum. This is the first time the Amphitheatre of Titus is mentioned by this name in the *Lib. Pont.*

[2] *Eumque in teterrimam retrudi fecerunt custodiam, quae vocatur Ferrata in cellario majore. Vita*, n. 274. A dungeon with gratings in the cellae or cellaria (cellar, vaults for stores) of the Lateran, under the charge of the Paracellarius.

Charles and Carloman, both already Patricians of the Romans, received Stephen's messenger, and, in answer to his request, immediately despatched twelve bishops to Rome, among them Turpin of Rheims.

The Lateran Synod, 769.

The Lateran Synod was opened by Stephen on August 12, 769. The condemnation of Constantine, the enquiry into the ordinations which had taken place during his pontificate, and the establishment of the laws for the papal election formed the subjects of deliberation.[1] The blinded Constantine, brought before the assembly in its first sitting, was asked how he, as layman, had ventured to ascend S. Peter's chair. "The Roman people raised me to it by force, because of all the oppressions it had formerly suffered under Paul I.," replied the unfortunate man. Then, stretching forth his hands, he fell on his face and begged for mercy.[2] He was dismissed without sentence being pronounced, and the next day his examination was resumed. The accused adroitly sheltered himself behind the example of other bishops, such as Sergius of Ravenna and Stephen of Naples, who had been raised directly from the condition of laymen to the papal chair.[3] The justice of the argument

[1] The fragment adduced above in Mansi, and also Labbé, *Concil.*, t. viii. 483. The substance of its contents is given in the *Lib. Pont.*

[2] *Ita coram omnibus professus est, vim se a populo pertulisse, et per brachium populi fuisse electum, atque coactum in Lateranense Patriarchium deductum propter gravamina, ac praejudicia illa, quae Romano populo ingesserat Domnus Paulus Papa. Lib. Pont.*, n. 277. A portion of the people, chiefly members of the aristocratic party, already began to regard the papal domination as an oppressive yoke.

[3] Sergius ably defended himself in Rome, where Stephen II. kept him a prisoner: *Laicus fui, et sponsam habui, et ad Clericatum perveni, et cognitum vobis factum est, et dixistis, nullum obstaculum*

inflamed the anger of the judges. The clergy, rushing upon Constantine, struck him to the ground and threw him outside the doors of the church. The remainder of his days are hid in silence.

The Synod committed the acts of the pretender to the flames, and passed the resolution that henceforward no one should be eligible for the pontificate who had not previously risen from the lowest ecclesiastical grade to the dignity of deacon, or presbyter-cardinal. The laity were debarred from taking part in the papal elections, or restricted solely to the right of acclamation.[1] With respect to the bishops ordained by Constantine, it was decreed that all such as had previously been presbyters or deacons should return to their former grade; that, however, had they gained the affection of their congregations, they could, after another election in Rome, receive consecration. The Council closed by passing a decree which confirmed the worship of images. After the acts of the Synod had been signed, the members of the Council marched in procession to S. Peter's, where the decisions were read aloud. Stephen thus purified the Church from the dangers of usurpation, but had not established his authority as Pope.

*mihi esse potest* (Agnellus, *Vita Sergii*, p. 424). He died in 769. Stephen, Dux of Naples and adherent of Rome, was elected bishop by the people. He died in 789.

[1] The decree of election of Stephen III. was revived in 862 or 863 by Pope Nicholas I. Niehues (*Die Wahldecrete Stephan's*, iii. u. vi.) asserts that a similar decree was issued by Stephen IV. (*Histor. Jahrb. der Görres-Gesellsch.*, 1880, pp. 141–153). That of Stephen IV. cannot, however, be proved with certainty.

## CHAPTER IV.

1. Power of Christophorus and Sergius in Rome—Stephen forms an Alliance with Desiderius—The King of the Lombards advances before the City—Fall of Christophorus and Sergius—The Pope's Share in their Tragic End—Project of double Marriage-Alliance between the Houses of Pavia and France—Counter-Intrigues of the Pope—Resistance of Ravenna—The Frankish Policy turns in favour of the Pope—Death of Stephen III., 772.

THE fall of Toto's faction and the overthrow of the Lombard party left Christophorus and Sergius the most influential men in Rome. They had headed the counter-revolution, had raised the new Pope to the throne, and, belonging as they did to a patrician family, they commanded a great number of adherents both in the city and the surrounding districts.

They stood, however, in the way alike of Pope Stephen and of King Desiderius. The Pope, whose election had pledged him to many concessions in their favour, they wished to rule. Desiderius they had irritated by their desertion of his cause, their successful repression of the Lombard faction, by

the favour they had shown the Frankish party, and the alliance into which they had entered with Carloman. They demanded lands and revenues from the Lombard King, but delayed to fulfil the obligations due to him for his aid in the overthrow of Toto and Constantine. Even Stephen himself recognised that the protective attitude assumed by the Franks towards Rome had been weakened by Pipin's death. His sons lived at open variance with each other and gave Rome cause to dread the evils of a divided kingdom. The Pope therefore found himself in a difficult position. He was ruler neither in Rome, where Christophorus and Sergius governed, nor in the Exarchate, where the Archbishop of Ravenna possessed supreme authority. He consequently made fresh overtures to the Lombard King, and the natural enemies entered into an alliance,[1] the foremost object of which was the overthrow of Christophorus and Sergius and their Frankish adherents.

Desiderius and Stephen III. form an alliance.

King and Pope made use of the Chamberlain Paul Afiarta, leader of the Lombard faction, as a common instrument. According to the compact, Desiderius, ostensibly as a pilgrim, but accompanied by an army, advanced to Rome. On the news of his approach, Christophorus and Sergius summoned the militia of Tuscany, Campania, and Perugia within the city, closed the gates, and awaited the attack; a fact which shows that the authority rested in their hands,

[1] *Igitur judicavit iste a finibus Perticae totam Pentapolim, et usque ad Tusciam, et usque ad mensam, Uvalani, velut Exarchus.* Agnellus, *Vita Sergii*, c. 4, 430. The statements of Agnellus, who is hostile to Rome, are confirmed by *Cod. Car.*, lv., in Cenni, li.

not in those of the Pope. On their side stood the Franks with Count Dodo, a legate of Carloman, whose presence in the city was not wholly accidental. The Frankish envoy, in supporting Christophorus and Sergius, who upheld the recognisedly legitimate alliance of the sacred chair with the Frankish monarchy, acted solely in the interests of his sovereign.[1]

Fall of Christophorus and Sergius, 769.

Desiderius arrived before S. Peter's in the summer of 769, and summoned the Pope to meet him. No opposition was offered,[2] and together they discussed the means of ridding themselves of the aristocrats, while Desiderius promised to satisfy all demands concerning the ecclesiastical estates, hitherto withheld. It was arranged that, on the return of the Pope, Afiarta was to stir up a revolt in order to bring about the death of Christophorus and Sergius; the art of provoking such revolts being already perfectly understood. In the present instance, however, the threatened party took the initiative. Under Dodo, they attacked the Lateran and the Pope was forced to seek refuge at an altar in the Basilica of Theodore, With drawn swords his assailants forced an entrance into the chapel. Stephen, however, succeeded in appeasing them, and so adroitly did the subtle Sicilian play his part, that his designs remained undiscovered, and the following day he was allowed to return to Desiderius. In order to create the belief

[1] The situation is explained by Sigurd Abel, *Jahrbücher des Fränk. Reichs unter Carl dem Groszen*, Berlin, 1866, i. 76.

[2] Jaffé postpones this interview to the year 771. All these occurrences must, however, have taken place before the discussion of the projected marriages between the courts of France and Pavia in 770.

that the sacrifice of the two powerful men, to whom he owed his elevation, had been forced upon him by Desiderius, Stephen now remained, to outward appearance, shut up with his followers in S. Peter's, and report led the people to believe that the Pope was in the hands of the Lombards, and would not be released until they laid down their arms and surrendered his opponents. In order to carry out the scheme, Stephen sent two bishops to the bridge outside S. Peter's gate, where Christophorus and Sergius lay encamped, and demanded that they should either voluntarily retire to a monastery or appear before him in the Vatican. The fickle people, in terror, deserted their leaders and dispersed; a sudden outbreak took place, and both men were lost. Even Gratiosus, brother-in-law of Sergius, deserted their cause and fled to the Pope in S. Peter's. Sergius now let himself down by the walls, with the intention of casting himself at the feet of Stephen;[1] he and his father, however, were seized by Lombard guards, and the King handed both men over to the Pope.

It is more than difficult to exonerate Stephen from the guilt of betraying to the vengeance of the Lombards, or the hatred of Paul Afiarta, men who had freed Rome from the tyranny of Toto, and to whom he himself owed the papal crown. Did he really wish to save them, as his biographer and he himself, in one of his letters, have maintained, why did he not bring them into the city when himself

[1] *Sergius eadem nocte, qua hora campana insonuit. Lib. Pont.*, n. 288. Bells were already rung in Rome.

returning from S. Peter's? He asserts that he left them behind in the basilica, in order to bring them in safety by night,[1] but that Afiarta forced his way into the church in the evening, the Lombard guards, by order of the King, offering no opposition to his entrance. Be that as it may, the unfortunate men themselves suffered in front of Hadrian's Bridge the fate which they had inflicted on Waldipert. Christophorus died in the convent of S. Agatha the third day after his eyes had been put out. Sergius recovered, and lingered in a cell of the Lateran until after Stephen's death. Such were the arts employed by the Pope to work the fall of his adversaries.

In his letter, however, to Charles and his mother Bertha, Stephen asserted that he knew nothing of the cruel treatment of the two men.[2] The letter was written by the Pope when in full possession of his liberty, probably soon after the withdrawal of the Lombards. The Pope therein exaggerates the events, terms Christophorus and Sergius companions

[1] *Et dum infra civitatem, nocturno silentio, ipsos salvos introducere disponeremus, ne quis eos conspiciens interficeret, subito hi, qui eis semper insidiabantur, super eos irruentes, eorum eruerunt oculos. Cod. Car.*, xlvi., Cenni, xlvi. 269. The writer in the *Lib. Pont.* says: *cupiens eos, noctis silentio propter insidias inimicorum salvos introduci Romam.* He was acquainted with Stephen's letter, but the deviations show that his inclinations were Frankish.

[2] With regard to these events Pope Adrian expressed himself to Desiderius's envoys as follows: *Subtilius mihi—Domnus Stephanus Papa retulit, inquiens, quod omnia illi mentitus fuisset* (sc. Desider.) *—et tantummodo per suum iniquum argumentum erui fecit oculos Christophori Primicerii, et Sergii Secundicerii filii ejus, suamque voluntatem de ipsis duobus proceribus Ecclesiae explevit, unde damnum magis et detrimentum nobis detulit. Vita Hadriani*, n. 293.

of the devil, men who, with the assistance of Dodo (against whom he is especially bitter), wished to murder him, and asserts that he owed his safety to Desiderius, who had purposely come to Rome to fulfil his obligations to S. Peter. His account tallies with that of his biographer, but not with his other letters ;[1] and if we desire further evidence as to the understanding which existed between him and Desiderius, it is found in the speech of Adrian, Stephen's successor in the Papacy, to the Lombard envoy. "My predecessor," said Adrian, "one day informed me that he sent his messengers Anastasius, the Chief Defensor, and Gemmulus, the sub-deacon, to the King to demand the fulfilment of his promises to S. Peter, and the King replied : 'Let Pope Stephen be satisfied with the fact that I have removed his rulers Christophorus and Sergius. He may now let his rights rest. For truly had I not come to the Pope's assistance, great evil would have befallen him. Carloman, the Frankish King, is the friend of Christophorus and Sergius, and with his army is ready to advance on Rome to avenge their death, and to seize the Holy Father himself.'"[2]

[1] Ep. xlvi., Cenni, xlv., 267. Cenni, together with Le Cointe and Pagi, is of opinion that the letter was written under compulsion, since noble men like Christophorus and Sergius could not suddenly be regarded as malefactors, nor the vile Lombards be transformed into illustrious sons. The letter was, however, written in the excitement consequent on the overthrow of the two men, and to flatter Desiderius, who received a copy. Muratori has perceived the rights of the case, and La Farina has adopted his opinion. The reason why Dodo's character is painted in the blackest colours is found in the fact that he was Carloman's envoy, and that the brothers were enemies at the time.

[2] *Lib. Pont.*, n. 293.

Dissensions between Stephen and Desiderius.

Meanwhile, Desiderius did not restore the ecclesiastical property claimed by Stephen, and the Pope sought to renew the natural alliance with the much-wronged Kings of the Franks. He therefore turned to them in complaint, and took occasion to wish them prosperity, now that their dissensions were at an end.[1] For Bertha had effected a reconciliation between her sons and had herself come to Rome as a pilgrim in 770.[2] Her presence had revived the papal hopes, but Stephen soon learned that the Queen had also visited Desiderius with the object of negotiating a double marriage between the royal houses of France and Lombardy. It was arranged that Prince Adelchis should marry Gisela, King Charles Desiderata (Ermengard), and his brother Carloman another daughter of the Lombard King. The project alarmed the Pope. He perceived that Pipin's sons in no way shared the views of their father, but, on the contrary, were wholly indifferent to the temporal needs of the Roman Church. By letter he sought to dissuade them from their projected marriages, and strove to sow fresh discord between the royal brothers.[3] "It has come to my knowledge," he wrote, "and fills my heart with dismay, that the Lombard King Desiderius seeks to persuade one of you to marry his daughter. The suggestion is truly diabolical, and such a union would be no marriage but concubinage. The history

[1] See with reference to this, *Cod. Car.*, xlvii., in Cenni, p. 274.

[2] *Annales Francor. ad Ann.* 770.

[3] The author of the *Libellus de imperatoria potestate in urbe Roma*, as early as the tenth century, says on this occasion: *seminans inter reges discordia. Mon. Germ.*, v. 720.

of Holy Scripture shows us many instances of princes transgressing the commands of God, and falling into grievous sin, through wanton alliance with a foreign nation. What madness were it if a distinguished scion of the royal house of your glorious Franks, a nation which excels all other nations, should sully himself by a union with the despised Lombards, a race never reckoned amongst the number of nations, and which has given birth to the family of lepers. By God's decree and your father's command you are already married in lawful wedlock, and, as befits illustrious princes, to women of your own country. You have received beautiful wives from the noble Frankish people, and to these women you must now remain faithful."[1] The Pope here takes for granted that both Kings were already married. As regards Carloman we know that he was married to Gilberga, but there is no mention of Charles being bound by any legal tie.[2] Stephen proceeds to make sarcastic comments on the character of women in general, quotes the sin of Eve, who had forfeited Paradise for mankind, reminds the monarchs of all that as youths they had promised the Apostle—friendship for the friends of the Pope, enmity for his enemies. To

[1] *Cod. Car.*, xlv., Cenni, xlix., 281 : *Perfida, quod absit, ac foetentissima Langobardor. gente polluatur, quae in numero gentium nequaquam computatur, de cujus natione et leprosum genus oriri certum est.* . . . Muratori would like to deny that the Pope wrote this vulgar letter, and even Cenni exclaims : *aevo illi dandum est aliquid.*

[2] Eginhard, c. 18, and Paul. Diacon., "Gesta Episcop. Mettensium" in the *Mon. Germ.*, ii. 265 : *hic ex Hildegard conjuge quattuor filios et quinque filias procreavit, habuit tamen ante legale connubium ex Himiltrude nobili puella filium nomine Pippinum.*

impart a supernatural power to the letter, Stephen laid it on the Apostle's grave, and received the Communion over it, then closed it with the following threat: "If any one dares to act in opposition to our exhortations herein contained, let him know that, by the authority of my master, the holy Peter, Prince of the Apostles, he is encompassed by the chains of the anathema, excluded from the kingdom of God, and condemned to burn in eternal fire with the devil and all the rest of the godless."[1] The age in which the chief priest of Christendom could write a letter such as this, was truly barbarous; the religion of Christ at the time appears actually a service of witchcraft.

Terrified, perhaps, by these threats, Carloman renounced the idea of marriage with the daughter of Desiderius, and remained faithful to Gilberga. Charles, however, undaunted by the papal anathema, wedded Desiderata.[2]

Meanwhile, troubles from another quarter increased

[1] *Anathematis vinculo esse innodatum, et a regno Dei alienum, atque cum diabolo et ejus atrocissimis pompis, et caeteris impiis aeternis incendiis concremandum, deputatum* = Formula of anathema in use at this period. It was placed on funeral monuments to prevent their destruction, or used at the close of documents. The inscription of a deed of gift of Georgius and Eustatius, in the vestibule of S. Maria in Cosmedin, belonging to the eighth century, says: *et anathematis vinculo sit innodatus et a regno Dei alienus, atque cum diabolo et omnib. impiis aeterno incendio deputatus.* The formula of anathema in the *Liber Diurn.*, c. vii. tit. 22, corresponds to the above curse almost word for word: *et cum diabolo et ejus atrocissimis Pompis atque cum Juda traditore Domini Dei et Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi, in aeternum igne concremandus, simulque in chaos demersus cum impiis deficiat.*

[2] Muratori maliciously remarks that Charles was not as yet "the Great."

Ravenna defies the Pope.

the difficulties of Stephen's position. Since the time of Pipin's donation the Popes had sent their own officials, Duces, Magistri Militum, and tribunes into the provinces formerly Greek; of which provinces, however, they were by no means masters. The people of Ravenna retained a lively recollection of the ancient importance of their city, which had long been mistress of Rome; and the archbishop soon began to extend his influence over the Exarchate, where the metropolis possessed several estates and farms. Sergius, reinstated in his office by Paul I., ruled there undisturbed, and after his death (in 770) a usurper succeeded for a whole year in defying the papal anathemas. A great number of the clergy placed the Archdeacon Leo on the archiepiscopal chair, but Michael, Librarian of the Church, with the consent of Desiderius and the aid of Maurice, Dux of Rimini (the most important town of the Pentapolis, and one exempt from obedience to the Pope),[1] made himself master of the seat. Leo was thrown into prison at Rimini, and Michael, in possession of the archbishopric, as well as Maurice and the judices of Ravenna, sent envoys to the Pope, in order, by means of lavish gifts, to induce him to ratify the usurpation. Stephen ordered Michael to vacate the chair; the intruder employed the wealth belonging

[1] Rimini continued to have Duces. The series in the ninth century is almost complete. Luigi Tonini, *Rimini dal principio dell' era volgare all anno MCC.*, Rimini, 1856, ii. 155. This town was the capital of the *Pentapolis maritima* (Rimini, Pesaro, Fano, Sinigaglia, Ancona); the *Pentapolis mediterranea* or *nova* embraced, Jesi, Cagli, Gubbio, Fossombrone, Urbino with Montefeltro, later Osimo. Both territories together were called Decapolis.

to the Church in maintaining his seat until the end of the year 771, when he was overthrown. The Frankish and Roman legates united in restoring order, and the populace surrendered Michael to the papal envoys to be conveyed to Rome, whither Leo also went to receive ordination.[1]

In the meantime, the tide of fortune in France had turned in favour of the Pope; for Charles had separated from Desiderata and Carloman died on the 4th December 771. Charles, in putting away his wife, seems to have been actuated less by caprice than by calculation.[2] He dissolved the irregular marriage, undoubtedly at the instigation of the Pope, and wedded the Swabian Hildegard. The Franks, however, remained loyal to Desiderata, bewailing her as his lawful wife, and Queen Bertha long wept the disgrace of her daughter-in-law.[3]

The alliance between the Franks and Lombards was thus severed by the arts of the Pope; the ties which bound Charles to the Roman Church were drawn as closely as before, and Desiderius was

[1] *Lib. Pont.*, "Vita Stephani III.," n. 282, 283; and in Adrian's Ep., *Cod. Car.*, lxxi., in Cenni, xciii. 449.

[2] *Incertum*, says Eginhard, *Vita Car.*, c. 18, *qua de causa.* An inventive monk at the end of the ninth century is alone acquainted with the cause: *quia esset clinica et ad propagandam prolem inhabilis, judicio sanctissimorum sacerdotum relicta velut mortua.* Monachi Sangall. Gesta Karoli II., c. 17, in the *Mon. Germ.*, ii. 759.

[3] It is recorded of Adelhard of Corbey: *culpabat modis omnibus tale connubium* (with Hildegarde)—*quod—rex inlicite uteretur thoro, propria sine aliquo crimine repulsa uxore. Ex Vita Adalhardi* 7, p. 525. And of Bertha, Eginhard says, c. 18: *ita ut nulla unquam invicem sit exorta discordia, praeter in divortio filiae Desiderii regis, quam illa suadente acceperat.*

abandoned to his fate. Stephen III. did not long survive these events; the unscrupulous Sicilian, versed in all the arts and stratagems of secular policy, dying on January 24, 772.

### 2. Adrian I.—Overthrow of the Lombard Party in Rome—Hostile advance of Desiderius—Fall of Paul Afiarta—The City Prefect—Desiderius lays waste the Roman Duchy—Adrian prepares for defence—Retreat of the Lombards.

Adrian I. succeeded to the pontificate, which he filled during an illustrious reign of nearly twenty-four years, on February 9, 772. He was a Roman and a member of a leading noble family who owned a palace in the Via Lata, close to S. Marco. His uncle Theodatus had borne the titles of Consul and Dux, and had been, moreover, Primicerius of the Notaries.[1] Adrian's father died during his childhood, and his mother entrusted the care of his education to the priests of S. Marco, in the parish of whose church her house was situated. Distinguished by birth, ability and beauty, Adrian rose under Pope Paul to the highest ecclesiastical offices; under Stephen he obtained the diaconate, and on Stephen's death he was unanimously elected to the Papacy.[2] Adrian I., 772–795.

[1] Theodatus (not Theodolus) restored S. Angelo in Pescaria, as a marble tablet still existing in the church records: *Theodotus holim dux nunc primicerius scae sed. ap. et pater uius Ben. Diac. a solo edificavit pro intercessionem animae suae et remedium omnium peccatorum.*

[2] Adrian's decree of election, deposited in the Lateran Museum, published by Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.*, i. 38, in the "Libellus de Vita Hadriana I." All the electoral bodies are therein mentioned.

One of the earliest acts of his reign was to recall the party of Christophorus, or all the judices sentenced to exile by Paul Afiarta, shortly before the death of Stephen.[1] Adrian thereby gave it to be understood that he would overthrow the Lombard faction which Paul still maintained in the city, and would support the Frankish alliance. Papal policy now adopted a definite course.

Adrian's first care was to see that Desiderius discharged his obligations to S. Peter. The envoys of the King arrived to congratulate the new Pope, and to invite him to form an alliance. Adrian, however, complained of the non-fulfilment of the treaty with his predecessor, and scarcely had the embassy returned with polite assurances to Pavia, when all thoughts of friendly relations with Desiderius were brought to an end. Various causes had contributed towards this result. The King was informed by his envoys of the restoration of the party of Christophorus and Sergius, and of the close alliance that existed between Rome and the Franks; and in the spring of 772, Gilberga, widow of Carloman, arrived at Pavia, with her children and Duke Auchar, to seek refuge at the court. Charles had seized the territories belonging to his nephew, and had caused himself to be proclaimed sole King of the Franks. Desiderius, deeply offended, received Charles's

[1] *Vita Adriani*, n. 292. A passage in Agnellus (*Vita Sergii*, p. 426) shows that a decree of amnesty was already customary on a change of pontiffs: *In ipsa vero die electus est praedictus, germanus defuncti Papae* (sc. Paulus) *in solio Apostolatus, et statim solvit omnes captivos, et omnibus noxiis veniam concessit.*

nephews with open arms, in the hope of kindling, by their means, a civil war in France. He called upon the Pope to recognise their rights by consecration, and when the Pope refused his demands, Desiderius resolved to obtain them by force. At the end of March he occupied Faventia and the duchy of Ferrara, and even threatened Ravenna. The Ravennese appealed to Adrian for help, and the Pope sent the Sacellarius Stephen and Paul Afiarta with urgent exhortations to the King. Desiderius insisted on a personal interview, in order to induce the Pope to crown the children of Carloman. This, however, Adrian firmly refused.

Rupture with Desiderius.

With these events was associated the overthrow of Afiarta, an event of some importance in the history of the city. On the fall of Christophorus and Sergius, Afiarta remained the most influential man in Rome. He was head of the Lombard party, and was in the pay of Desiderius. He must therefore be rendered powerless to harm. His fall was planned and carried out with diplomatic subtlety. The unsuspecting chamberlain was persuaded to leave Rome and undertake an embassy to his friend Desiderius; while he was boasting at the Lombard court that he would bring thither the Pope, were it in chains, the noose was drawn round his own neck. Only now had the Romans the courage to admit that, eight days before Stephen's death, Paul had been guilty of another murder. The unfortunate Sergius still lingered in his blindness in a cell of the Lateran, and the continuance of this pitiable existence had been found so insupportable to the vindictive Afiarta that,

Fall of Afiarta.

during Stephen's illness, he determined to rid himself of the object of his hate. He left the execution of the murder to two inhabitants of Anagni, while the Dux John, brother of the Pope,[1] and various ecclesiastical officials of exalted rank were accessory to the deed. One night Sergius was dragged into the Via Merulana, a street which still leads from the Lateran to S. Maria Maggiore, was there stabbed, and his remains buried on the spot.[2]

The murderers confessed the crime and the scene of its execution; the ecclesiastical dignitaries, the Judices of the Militia, and the entire populace demanded the punishment of the guilty, and the Pope handed them over to the ordinary jurisdiction. On this occasion the City Prefect, whose office had survived the days of Gregory, and on whom the execution of all criminal sentences devolved, suddenly reappears.[3] The murderers were banished to Constantinople. At this period, as in the time of Scipio and Seneca, exile was looked on in the light of capital

[1] *Tunissone Presbytero, et Leonatio Tribuno habitatoribus civitatis Anagninae. Vita Adr.*, n. 297.

[2] The street was thus named from a palace; *usque in Merolanam ad arcum depictum . . . secus viam, quae ducit ad ecclesiam S. Dei Genitricis ad Praesepe. Vita Adr.*, n. 298. *Merolanas* in the *Ordo Roman.*, i. (Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.*, ii. 4), a book of formulae compiled soon after the time of Adrian. Remains of an ancient house with a semi-circular building, the walls of which were painted, were discovered in the Merolana in 1874. That any connection, however, exists between this building and the *arcus depictus*, I dare not affirm.

[3] *Vita Adr.*, n. 298: *tunc praefatus s. Praesul precib. judicum universique pop. Rom. jussit contradere antefatum Calvulum cubicularium, et praenominatos Campanos praefecto urbis, ut more homicidarum eos coram universo populo examinaret.* The phrase *esaminare* goes far back into mediaeval times.

punishment, and Rome continued to banish her offenders to Constantinople, as in earlier days, and perhaps even in the eighth century Byzantium exiled her criminals to Rome; the Pope thus continued to recognise the Emperor's supremacy.

In consequence of the trial, the remains of Christophorus and Sergius received honourable burial in S. Peter's and their names public acquittal. Before, however, the trial had begun, Adrian charged Leo, Archbishop of Ravenna, to seize Afiarta, should he, on his return from the Lombard court, enter Ravenna or any other city of the Exarchate. The commission was quickly executed, and Adrian forwarded the documents of the trial to Leo, who surrendered the accused into the hands of the criminal judge of Ravenna.[1] A Roman citizen, an official of the papal palace, was thus, contrary to all law, brought before the municipal jurisdiction of another city. It is hard to believe that the archbishop alone was responsible for the despotic act. More probably the Pope desired that the trial should take place at a distance.[2] And as he wished to spare the life of the murderer of Sergius, he begged the Emperors Constantine and Leo to allow Afiarta to undergo his sentence somewhere in Greece.[3] In answer to the demand that

[1] *Tradidit eundem Paulum consulari Ravennatium urbis. Ibid.*, n. 299. Hegel, i. 262, with good reason refutes the opinion that by Consularis was intended the college of Consuls, which, according to the views of Savigny and Leo, had taken the place of the Decurions.

[2] *Ita vero idem Paulus examinatus est, quia etiam nec scientia exinde data est—Pontifici. Vita Adr.*, n. 300; the papal biographers, however, conceal many things.

[3] *Adscribi fecit suggestionem suam Constantino et Leoni Augustis,*

he should be sent to Byzantium by way of Venice, the archbishop replied that this was impossible, as the Venetians would exchange the son of their Doge Maurice, at the time imprisoned by Desiderius, for Afiarta. It was consequently determined that Paul should be brought to Rome, but when the papal messengers, sent to conduct him thither, arrived, the prisoner was dead. Nothing remained for Adrian but to rebuke the archbishop for his only too welcome haste.[1] Thus was the head of the Lombard faction removed, the Pope freed from a powerful aristocrat, and Desiderius deprived of the last remnant of Lombard influence in Rome.

Desiderius advances against Rome.

In consequence of these events the King occupied Sinigaglia, Montefeltro, Urbino, and Eugubium (Gubbio), and entered Etruria. The Lombards here attacked the city of Bleda, in July, put several of the more prominent citizens to death, and withdrew to Utriculum.[2] Adrian sent the Abbot of Farfa with twenty monks to Desiderius. Weeping, the

*magnisque Imperatoribus—ut in ipsis Graeciae partibus in exilio mancipatum retineri praecepissent. Ibid.*, n. 300.

[1] The *Lib. Pont.* speaks of the Chartularius Anualdus as at this time present in Ravenna. The name (Anwald) is German; this envoy of the Pope is distinguished by the title *civis Romanus*. He was, therefore, probably the founder of the Roman family of the Anialdi or Anibaldi. De Rossi, *Bull.*, 1873, p. 25, attributes the epitaph of a Paul in the time of Adrian, from the Ind. vi. (783), to Afiarta, whose remains he supposes to have been brought from Ravenna to Rome. The supposition, however, cannot be verified.

[2] The ancient Utriculi Civitas was rich in treasures of art in the days of the Empire. Since the excavations of Pius VI., to this little provincial town the museums of Rome have owed many of their valuable works of art, such, for instance, as the Head of Jupiter and the large mosaic in the Rotunda of the Vatican.

brothers threw themselves at the feet of the King, imploring him not to injure S. Peter. The Lombard dismissed them without according them a hearing, but summoned the Pope to an interview. The Pope answered that he would come as soon as Desiderius had restored the cities which he had usurped, and sent some priests in order to be informed of their surrender. The King, however, would not hear of any surrender, and threatened to march on Rome.

The Pope now summoned Charles to his aid, conjuring him by the memory of his father Pipin to deliver Rome from the Lombard King, whose repeated entreaties for the consecration of Carloman's children he had steadfastly refused. While the messengers entrusted with the papal letters were on their way, Desiderius departed in person from Pavia. He was accompanied by Adelchis, the Frankish Duke Auchar, and by Gilberga and her children, whose coronation at the hands of the Pope in S. Peter's he intended to compel. Adrian prepared for resistance. After collecting forces from Tuscany, Latium, the duchy of Perugia, even armed militia from the Pentapolis, and reinforcements lent him by Stephen, the friendly Dux of Naples, he closed the gates of the city, going so far as to have some of them walled up.[1] He caused the altar vessels from the Basilicas of S. Peter and S. Paul to be conveyed into the city, and the churches them-

[1] *Fabricari fecit*, the customary expression for wall-building. After the time of Christophorus and Sergius, the inhabitants of the country districts of Tuscany and Latium (Campagna) were obliged to render military service in the city.

selves barred within, in fear that the King should sacrilegiously force an entrance. Adrian next sent the Bishops of Albano, Praeneste, and Tibur to meet Desiderius, instructing the envoys to forbid him, under pain of excommunication, to cross the frontiers of the Roman duchy. The bishops encountered the King at Viterbo. The terrors of the papal censures and, yet more, the dread of Charles proved effectual. The King halted and turned in retreat.[1] All the undertakings of Desiderius showed the same fatal lack of courage and genius, and few studies can be more wearisome than the military annals of his nation during a period of two hundred years.

Desiderius turns in retreat.

Soon after his retreat, envoys from Charles (Bishop George, the Abbot Gulfard, and Albinus, Counsellor of the King) appeared in Rome to convince themselves that the cities, as Desiderius asserted, had actually been restored to the Holy See. Adrian enlightened them on the subject. The envoys hastened to Pavia; the King dismissed them with contempt, and they told Charles that nothing could be effected but by force of arms.

### 3. Charles's Expedition to Italy—Siege of Pavia—He celebrates Easter in Rome—Confirms Pipin's Donation—Fall of Pavia and the Lombard Kingdom, 774.

After having again proposed peace to Desiderius, and vainly offered him an indemnity for the

[1] *Rex illico cum magna reverentia a civitate Viterbiense confusus ad propria reversus est.*

surrender of the cities, Charles, with his army, set forth for Italy (September 773)[1] and advanced to Geneva, with the intention of crossing Monte Cenis. The Alpine passes, however, had been rendered impracticable by the Lombards, and the difficulty of advancing, probably also the murmurs of the Franks, induced him to despatch another embassy to Desiderius, to explain that he would be satisfied with three distinguished hostages, as guarantee for the surrender of the cities. Desiderius declined the proposal. The sudden flight, however, of his panic-stricken son, Adelchis, and the prospect, which treachery had rendered possible, that the Franks would cross the Alps, forced him to abandon his camp and entrench himself within Pavia.[2] Adelchis and Auchar, in terror, sought refuge with the widow and sons of Carloman in strongly fortified Verona, and the race of Alboin fell after a feeble resistance, shortened by internal dissensions, especially clerical intrigues.[3] It was assuredly not by his conquest of the Lombards that Charles acquired the title of Great; on the contrary, a conquest achieved with so little effort, and followed by so great and enduring

Charles departs for Italy, 773.

[1] *Promittens insuper ei tribui quatuordecim millia auri solidorum, quantitatem in auro, et argento. Lib. Pont.*, n. 313. Leo (*History of Italy*) conjectures that this was the demand which Desiderius had originally made to Rome.

[2] Agnellus says (*Vita Leonis*, p. 439) that the Ravennese deacon Martinus had shown the way to the Franks; according to the *Chron. Novalicense*, it was a jester.

[3] In general, the well-known epitaph, given by Paul. Diacon, on the valiant Droctulf in Ravenna, applies to the Lombard people:—

*Terribilis visu facies, sed corda benigna.*

results, is scarcely to be found in the records of history.

He lays siege to Pavia.

Charles surrounded Pavia, and, foreseeing a protracted siege, caused his wife, Hildegard, and his children to be conveyed to the camp. Another Frankish force appeared before Verona, and Auchar, with Carloman's widow and the little princes, surrendered themselves into the hands of the victor. Pavia made a gallant resistance for six months; Easter was near at hand, and Charles determined to celebrate the festival in Rome. An Easter pilgrimage to the graves of the martyrs was, in the eyes of the faithful in those days, the surest way to Paradise; and for nearly two hundred years troops of pilgrims had journeyed to Rome at Eastertide. Throughout the entire Middle Ages we shall see emperors and kings constantly following their example; the present journey of the Frankish monarch being the first in the long series of pilgrimages undertaken by German kings.[1]

Comes to Rome, April 2, 774.

Charles, with a part of his army, and accompanied by a distinguished train of bishops, dukes and counts, quitted the camp at Pavia, and marched rapidly through Tuscany in order to reach Rome by Easter Eve (April 2, 774). The reception accorded to the powerful Protector of the Church, who entered the city for the first time, and in circumstances so momentous, was royal and magnificent. At a station called Novas, below the Lake of Bracciano, twenty-four miles distant from the city, he was met by all the

[1] Charles's entrance to Rome, and his sojourn in the city, are minutely described in the *Vita Adriani*, n. 314, *sq.*

judices and standard-bearers of the militia, sent by the Pope to greet him.[1] At the foot of Monte-Mario he was received by the united bands of militia, with their patrons, by the schools of children bearing branches of palm and olive in their hands, and by an immense crowd, who greeted his arrival with the solemn shout: "Hail to the King of the Franks, and Defender of the Church."[2] Charles accepted these honours, not as a foreign prince, but in his character of Patricius of the Romans, and the chronicler significantly informs us that the crosses and banners of the Roman basilicas had been sent to meet him, as had been the custom on the reception of an Exarch.[3] No sooner did Charles perceive them than, dismounting from his horse and surrounded by his attendants, he advanced humbly on foot to S. Peter's. It was early in the morning of Easter Eve. The Pope awaited his guest on the steps of the portico. Around him were the clergy, while an immense throng filled the piazza. Charles prostrated himself at the foot of the steps, climbed them on his knees, reverently kissing each step in turn until he reached

[1] *Direxit—judices ad fere triginta millia ab hac Romana urbe in locum, qui vocatur Novas.* The station stands at the twenty-fourth milestone. Holstenius, in Vignoli (note 3, c. 35), states that he has seen the ruins of Novas two miles on this side of Bracciano.

[2] *Scholas militiae cum patronis, simulque et pueris, qui ad discendas literas pergebant, deportantes omnes ramos palmarum atque olivarum,* &c. Papencordt (p. 98) erroneously holds these *patroni militiae* to have been patron saints, instead of the chiefs of the military companies. I find the expression *patronus* used for the first time for tutelary saints in *Vita Adr.*, n. 339.

[3] *Venerandas cruces, id est signa, sicut mos est ad Exarchum aut Patricium suscipiendum.* Soon afterwards, however: *cruces, ac signa.*

the Pope. Such was the form in which the mightiest prince of the universe already approached the Roman Sanctuary. Must not the time, therefore, come when kings should humble themselves and become the vassals and servants of the Pope? when the Pontiff should boldly place his foot on the neck of his slave? Charles and Adrian embraced each other; the King took the Pope by the right hand, and, walking on his right side, entered the basilica with him.[1] As they passed the threshold the solemn words: *Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini* burst from the lips of the officiating priests. Charles and his Franks fell prostrate on their knees before the Apostle's grave. Their devotions ended, the King courteously demanded permission to enter Rome and visit the other principal churches. Before leaving the basilica, however, he and his followers descended to the crypt, where King and Pope, the judices of the Romans and the Franks, mutually tendered the oath of security.[2]

[1] It is a much disputed point as to whether right or left was the side of honour, and wherefore, on mosaics and seals, Peter is represented on the left, Paul on the right side. The place of honour was, apparently, determined from the point of view of the observers. When Pope and King entered the church, the Pope was on the right of the observers. *Ordo Roman.*, i., in Mabillon, ii. 3: *episcopi quidem ad sinistram intrantium, presbyteri vero ad dextram, ut quando Pontifex sederit, ad eos respiciens, episcopus ad dextram sui, presbyteros vero ad sinistram contueatur.*

[2] *Seseque mutuo per sacramentum munientes, ingressus est Romam.* In later times, before entering Rome, the Emperors gave and received the oath of peace. This was, at the same time, a sealed bond of friendship, *firmitas et integritatis stabilitas*, as Adrian says, *Cod. Car.*, liii. in Cenni, lii. 326.

The Frankish troops doubtless encamped on the Neronian Field, but Charles himself crossed by the bridge of Hadrian and entered the city, which little knew that in the first Frankish King who trod her streets she received her first Emperor of German race. The future successor of Augustus looked at the classic ruins as he passed them by in ignorant bewilderment, for although he delighted in the history of antiquity, he was more versed in the annals of the saints than in those of the statesmen or heroes of Rome. The city that met his gaze, in spite of the ravages of three hundred years, still bore the impress of antiquity. It was still the city of the ancient Romans, a world of magnificent ruins, before the greatness of which the monuments of Christian times were lost in insignificance.

The people led the King to the Lateran, gazing with astonishment on the heroic and almost gigantic form of the Protector of the Church, and on his mail-clad barbarian paladins. After having witnessed the Pope administer the Sacrament of Baptism in the Baptistery, Charles returned humbly on foot to S. Peter's. He did not make his residence in the city. No mention is made of the Palace of the Caesars, the last habitable portion of which had fallen into ruin since it had ceased to be the dwelling of the Greek Dux. Charles undoubtedly made his abode in one of the episcopal houses near S. Peter's. On Easter day the King was conducted by the Optimates and the schools of the militia to S. Maria (Maggiore); the Pope read mass here, and afterwards entertained the King at dinner in the Lateran. Charles

attended service on Monday in S. Peter's, on Tuesday in S. Paul's; and with the latter function the Easter solemnities ended. The ancient character of these services was less pompous and more ecclesiastical than at the present day, but, as the ancient books of ritual serve to show, not much more simple.[1]

On Wednesday, April 6th, Charles was invited to attend a conference in S. Peter's, at which the Pope and all the judices of the clergy and militia were assembled. In presence of this company, Adrian addressed a speech to the Frankish King, and for the purpose which he had in view, that of extorting a donation from Charles, the Pope assuredly could have found no more fitting site than the immediate neighbourhood of the Apostle's grave, and the basilica still fragrant with Easter incense. While the Pope foresaw the approaching overthrow of the Lombard kingdom, he appeared in the light of one of its immediate heirs. He therefore reminded Charles of the ancient treaties and promises, exhorted him to present certain cities and provinces to S. Peter, and caused Pipin's deed of gift to be read aloud. Adrian's biographer assures us that the King and his judices not only confirmed the contents of the document, but that Charles caused it to be transcribed afresh by his notary, Etherius. The deed was deposited in

[1] Regulations with regard to the Mass and the prayers for Charles are contained in the *Ordo Romanus*, i., a remarkable book of ritual belonging to the eighth or ninth century. The Easter stations remain the same down to present times: on Sunday, S. Maria Maggiore; on Monday, S. Peter; on Tuesday, S. Paul; on Wednesday, S. Lorenzo.

the crypt of S. Peter's, and sworn to with an oath of awful solemnity.

Charles confirms Pipin's donation, April 6, 774.

This so-called donation of Charles the Great, which was, according to the statements of Adrian's biographer, a ratification of the donation of Pipin at Kiersey, has disappeared from among the archives of the Lateran, and the copy, which the King was supposed to have taken with him, has never been discovered either in Germany or France. It is asserted that, according to its provisions, the generous monarch bestowed almost the whole of Italy on the Pope, and further, provinces, such as Corsica, Venice, Istria, and the duchy of Benevento, which he had never even conquered.[1] The unprejudiced judgment of critics, however, has long since relegated this donation to the realm of fable; and it is probable that, if such a document ever really existed, Adrian's biographer either employed an already-existing forgery, or himself falsified the statements therein contained. Charles evidently confirmed the donation of Pipin, which, although unauthenticated, undoubtedly related to the Exarchate, reserving for

[1] The text of the *Vita Adriani*, according to Vignoli, says: *a Lunis* (the present Sarzana) *cum insula Corsica, deinde in Suriano, deinde in monte Burdone inde in Berceto, deinde in Parma, deinde in Regio, et exinde in Mantua, atque in Monte Silicis, simulque et universum Exarchatum Ravennatium, sicut antiquitus erat, atque provincias Venetiarum et Istriam, necnon et cunctum ducatum Spoletinum seu Beneventanum.* Compare Docum. i. in Borgia, *Breve Istor. Cod. Vatic.*, 3833. It is important to note that no historian, except the chronicler of the *Lib. Pont.*, is aware of the donation. The fragment of the *Vita Adriani* in Mabillon merely says: *Carolus non prius destitit, donec Desiderium—exilio damnaret—resque direptas Adriano Papae restitueret*, a phrase taken almost word for word from Eginhard.

himself the sovereignty over the provinces to which it referred; and in the course of time he added to this donation other patrimonies and revenues.[1] His own attitude towards Rome was defined by a treaty; he claimed all the privileges of the Patricius. The honorary title of Defensor received in 774 a more extended significance, the highest jurisdiction in Rome, the duchy and the provinces of the Exarchate, being allotted to the Patricius of the Romans. The Pope, who possessed nothing beyond the administration in these districts, thus became the subject of the King of the Franks.[2]

His relations towards Rome having been defined, Charles took his leave, and the Pope caused prayers to be offered in all churches for the successful issue of the siege of Pavia.[3] The King of the Franks hastened operations on his return to the camp;

[1] This donation, which is believed in by Cenni, Orsi, Fontanini, and Borgia, is rejected by Muratori. Ficker, Waitz, Genelin, and other writers have again advanced the opinion that the donation of Kiersey actually embraced all the territories specified in the *Vita Adriani*. This opinion is especially maintained by Abel, *Unterg. des Langobardenreichs*, p. 37, f., and *Jahrb. d. Fränk. Reichs unter Carl. d. Gr.*, i. 31. Sickel holds the same view, but adds that the extent of the rights accorded to the Popes in certain territories and places remains undefined; that, for instance, in Corsica, the donation only had reference to patrimonies (*Acta Karolinor.*, ii. 380). On the other hand, Sybel (*Kl. histor. Schriften*, iii., *Die Schenkungen der Karolinger an die Päpste*, 1881) rejects the entire donation. The views of the latest writers on the controversy are to be found in Martens, *Die röm. Frage*, p. 283, f.

[2] The Ep. Hadriana ad Bertherium Vienn., *Ep.* (Labbé, *Conc.*, vii. 534) *dat. Kal. Jan. imp. piissimo Aug. Constantino, annuente Deo coronato piiss. rege Karolo, anno primo patriciatus ejus*, is spurious.

[3] *Cod. Carol.*, lv., in Cenni, l. 318. There were at this time twenty-eight basilicas, but only seven diaconates.

pestilence conspired with treachery, and the afflicted city surrendered in June 774. The last Lombard King paid the penalty of his indiscretion in the fall of his dynasty and kingdom, and yielded himself unconditionally a prisoner. Desiderius retired to the monastery of Corbie, and there ended his days, known, it is said, as a pious worker of miracles. Charles meanwhile took the Iron Crown, and henceforward (774) styled himself King of the Franks and Lombards, and Patricius of the Romans; while Adelchis, the fugitive son of Desiderius, escaped to the Byzantine court and entered on the dreary existence of a royal pretender.[1]

Fall of the Lombard kingdom.

4. CONSTANTINE'S DONATION—GEOGRAPHICAL LIMITS OF THE CAROLINE DONATION: SPOLETO; TUSCANY; THE SABINA; RAVENNA—CHARLES CLAIMS THE RIGHT OF CONFIRMING THE ARCHBISHOPS OF RAVENNA—THE PATRICIATE OF S. PETER—EVIDENCE THAT THE POPE SUBMITTED TO CHARLES'S SUPREMACY—TRAFFIC IN SLAVES AMONG THE GREEKS AND VENETIANS.

To the grief of the Pope, Charles delayed the surrender of those patrimonies of which the Church had been deprived by the Lombards. He failed to fulfil his contract, probably because, as a statesman,

[1] *Karolus grat. dei Rex. Francor. et Langobardor. ac patritius Romanor.* Diploma of June 9, 776, in which Charles confirms all the Lombard grants to the Abbey of Farfa. *Reg. Farfa.*, n. 147. The title of Patricius is, however, occasionally omitted from documents; thus, in an instrument concerning the abbey of Monte Amiata, of December 1, 774, we find only: *Regnante Domino n. Carolo Rege Francor. et Langobardor.* (*Cod. Dipl. della Badia di S. Salvadore all' monte Amiato*, Bibl. Sessoriana in Rome).

he realised that Pipin had been too liberal in his promises. He seemed to set no value on the title of the new Constantine, with which Adrian flattered him, as if the early Emperor, "through whom God had deigned to bestow everything on the Holy Church of the Apostolic Prince," had again arisen.[1]

The donation of Constantine.

The words employed by Adrian are worthy of note, as containing the first allusion to the monstrous forgeries, which served successive Popes, century after century, as an authentic foundation for universal dominion; for the same length of time satisfied the uncritical public, and even succeeded in gaining the acceptance of jurists. The notorious "Donation of Constantine" not only endowed the Bishop of Rome with Imperial honours, and the Roman clergy with the prerogatives of the Senate, but surrendered Rome and Italy into the hands of the Pope as his property. It represented that Constantine, cured by Bishop Sylvester of leprosy by baptism, out of reverence to the Prince of the Apostles, had humbly quitted Rome and retired to a corner of the Bosphorus,

[1] *Cod. Carol.*, xlix., in Cenni, lix. 352: *quia ecce novus Christianiss. Dei Constantinus Imp. his temporib. surrexit, per quem omnia Deus Sanctae suae Ecclesiae . . . largiri dignatus est.* Adrian in his letter speaks merely of patrimonies and of the potestas in Italy: *Piissimo Constantino magno, per cujus largitatem S. R. E.—exaltata est, et potestatem in his Hesperiae partibus largiri dignatus est.* The letter belongs to the year 777, or is, at least, earlier than 781. The chronology of Adrian's forty-nine letters to Charles is at times obscure; the year 781, in which the Pope becomes co-sponsor with the King, divides the letters into two groups. All bearing the title *spiritalis compater* are of later date than 781. The statements of Muratori, Le Cointe, and Pagi are generally rectified by Cenni, and still more completely by the great work of Jaffé.

resigning the capital of the world and Italy to the successors of S. Peter.[1] This fable, appealed to for the first time by a Pope in 777, was the work of a Roman priest, devised at the time when the Greek government in Italy was in process of dissolution, when the kingdom of the Lombards was falling asunder, and when the bold idea of setting himself up as ruler of a great part of Italy first entered the brain of the Pope. Its fabrication reveals the barbarism of mankind in the Middle Ages more, perhaps, than many productions of religious enthusiasm.

If the donation of Constantine betrays the insatiable lust for power cherished by the Roman priesthood, it serves at the same time as an historic witness to those views which had been developed, shortly before the restoration of the Western Empire, with regard to the relations between Church and State. The Church is here represented as a spiritual empire with a Caesar-Pope, to whom all metropolitans and bishops in East and West are subject. Its hierarchical constitution, which arose on the foundation of the ancient Imperial hierarchy, is considered independent even of the Emperor, the supreme director of all civil affairs; its model is the Empire and the Imperial court. The Pope is endowed with Imperial dignity, the Roman clergy with senatorial rank, but this

[1] As in mediaeval Rome the spot was pointed out where Peter and Paul had taken leave of one another, so the place of the parting between Pope and Emperor was also shown: *arcus Romanus inter Aventinum et Albiston, ubi beatus Silvester et Constantinus osculati sunt et diviserunt se* (*Mirabilia, descr. plenaria*, in Urlich's *Cod. U. R. Topogr.*, p. 94).

authority, like the cession of Rome and Italy, originates from a "privilegium" of the Emperor, out of which the legal foundation of the temporal power of the Papacy for all time arose. While the Empire remains the highest conception of all temporal majesty, from which alone the Church derives her civil form and power, this Church is, at the same time, recognised by the Emperor as a self-existing spiritual kingdom, the monarch of which is Christ, its founder; while the vicar of Christ is the Pope. In such terms Constantine's donation pronounces the separation of the two powers, the spiritual and the temporal, and in its principal features indicates the dual relation in which Church and Empire, Pope and Emperor, stood towards each other throughout the entire Middle Ages.[1]

Charles was long harassed by the importunate exhortations of the Pope, who, with bitter reproaches, incessantly reminded him of his promises of the year 774. It therefore becomes necessary to examine the various territories comprised within this Carolingian donation, since the history of the provinces of which

[1] Döllinger ("Die Schenkung Constantin's," *Papstfabeln des Mittelalters*, München, 1863) has demonstrated that this fiction is of Roman origin, and falls between the years 752 and 777. It is, however, to be discovered even earlier than 752. It was only translated into Greek at a late date. Fabricius, *Bibl. Graeca*, vi. It is mentioned by Aeneas Parisiensis about 854. In the course of time the donation was extended to the entire West. Not until the fifteenth century was it refuted by the crushing criticism of Valla. For an inquiry into the ideas therein contained, see L. K. Aegidi, *Der Fürstenrath nach dem Lüneviller Frieden*, Berlin, 1853, p. 129; Grauert, *Hist. Jahrb. d. Görresges.*, 1883; J. Langen, *Gesch. d. R. K. von Leo I.*, &c., p. 725.

the donation treats cannot be severed from that of Rome. If Adrian's biographer is correct, the Spoletans, who had several times already tried to sever themselves from the Lombard kingdom, succeeded in the attempt before the Franks entered Italy. Influential citizens, both of Spoleto and Reate, came to Rome, did homage to the Pope, and received the symbols of Roman citizenship by the cutting of hair and beard. On Desiderius's escape to Pavia, however, envoys from the same duchy appeared in Adrian's presence, tendered him the oath of allegiance, and received from him the ratification of Hildebrand, whom they themselves had previously chosen as their duke. Their example was followed by the inhabitants of Fermo, Osimo, Ancona, and the Castellum Felicitatis.[1] All these statements are, however, doubtful; but that Charles absolutely refused to cede Spoleto to the Pope, and that Spoleto henceforward belonged uninterruptedly to the Frankish kingdom, is beyond all question.[2]

Geographical limits of the Carolingian donation. Spoleto.

[1] The Castellum Felicitatis, formerly Tifernum, was later known as Città di Castello. Letter of Gregory IX. to Frederick II. in 1230: *Castellum Felicitatis, quod nunc dicitur Civitas de Castello.* Huillard, *Hist. Dipl. Friderici II.*, vol. iii. 249.

[2] Muratori, *ad Ann.* 775, and the Acts in the Chronicle of Farfa. In spite of the *Cod. Carol.*, lviii., Cenni, lvi. 341: *quia et ipsum Spoletinum Ducatum vos praesentialiter obtulistis protectori vestro B. Petro*, the papal party have never ventured to claim anything beyond the *dominium utile* for the Pope. The Church had no more right to Spoleto than to Istria, where she was also the owner of some estates. Fatteschi, *Memorie—de' Duchi di Spoleto*, p. 50, maintains that the entire country, although without any sovereign rights, was made over to the Pope. With regard to this question, see W. Martens, *Die römische Frage*, p. 142.

Tuscany.

Further claims made by S. Peter in Roman Tuscany remained undisputed, but beyond this province the Apostle also claimed property in Lombard Tuscany. It was asserted that in 774 Charles had presented Soana, Tuscana, Viterbo, Balneum Regis (Bagnorea), with other places not mentioned, to the Pope. Adrian expressly speaks of these estates in a letter, from which it would appear that they had actually been ceded to him. There was later a further promise of two cities, Rosellae and Populonia in Tuscia Ducalis, which Charles hesitated to surrender.[1] The Church had possessed estates from old times throughout Tuscany, which had been seized by the Lombards, and the magnanimous Charles now added to these estates the gift of new patrimonies, without, however, abandoning his rights as successor of the Lombard Kings.

Sabina.

The same state of things prevailed in the Sabine territory. Here the Church also owned estates, to which Charles apparently made large additions, awarding them afresh to S. Peter in 781. It has been asserted that, at the same time, he made a new treaty with the Pope; that Adrian, in consideration of a tribute, relinquished all claim to the duchies of Tuscany and Spoleto, but received a part of Lombard Tuscany and the Sabina. These assertions,

[1] *Cod. Carol.*, xc., in Cenni, lxxxix. 480. Cenni includes Tuscia Regalis (Toscana) in the donation, although without rights of sovereignty. He bases this opinion on the *Cod. Carol.*, lxv., in his work, lxiii., where the Pope gives orders to the Dux of Lucca, who, however, pays no attention. Gregory I., however, without having been ruler either in Naples or Sardinia, had already issued commands to the Duces of both provinces.

however, are not supported by any evidence.[1] The estates in the Sabina bore the names Territorium and Patrimonium Savinense, but did not include the entire province, the greater part of which belonged to the Duke of Spoleto. We are ignorant of the extent of the estates of the Church in this district, the revenues of which were devoted to the maintenance of the lamps in S. Peter's and to the poor. Legates of Charles, and the Pope went thither to assume possession, but differences about the boundaries arose between the Church and Rieti, and, although veterans a hundred years old testified to the fact that the lands in question had belonged to the Church since ancient times, these differences were not settled to the advantage of the saint.[2] It follows that, at the end of the eighth century, the Church only retained the smaller part of the Sabina, and not until after 939 can it be proved by documents that the province was separated from the duchy of Spoleto, and made to constitute a special Comitatus under the supremacy of the Church, by whose rectors, under the title of Marchio or Comes, it was administered.[3]

Ravenna.

If the Pope found difficulty in making himself master of these territories, the trouble he encountered

[1] This view has been advanced by Ficker, *Untersuch.*, ii. 366.

[2] *Cod. Carol.*, lvi., in Cenni, lxxi. 405. See also Ep. lxviii. 387. He entreats that the frontiers may be defined, *sicut ex antiquitus fuit . . . signa inter partes constituentes.* The Roman boundary appears as *signum.*

[3] Fatteschi, pp. 93, 248. Previous to the year 939 no document relating to the Sabina is found in the register of Farfa. A. 939: *Ingilbaldus Dux et rector territorii Sabinensis;* the dates of the reign of the Pope are here given. A. 941: *Sarilonis Marchionis et Rectoris Territorii Sabinensis*, &c. These were unquestionably papal rectors.

in the Exarchate was much more serious. S. Apollinaris in Ravenna, like S. Peter in Rome, possessed several estates, and could produce numerous deeds of gift from the archives. As early as the seventh century, the Church of Ravenna drew revenues so considerable from Sicily, that the rectors of her estates on the island could yearly send vessels laden with 25,000 bushels of grain, with fruits and vegetables, with skins dyed purple, with draperies of hyacinth-blue silk, woollen stuffs and other such valuable articles, as to produce a revenue of no less than 31,000 gold solidi; 15,000 of which fell to the Treasury in Constantinople, while the remaining 16,000 flowed into the episcopal coffers.[1] The archbishops, equally with the Popes, strove for temporal authority within their beauteous domains; but after Pipin's donation the Popes succeeded in making good their claims, and Stephen II. sent his Comites and Duces into the towns of the Ravennese territory. Two judices had even appeared in the city; the presbyter Philip for spiritual, and the Dux Eustachius for secular affairs.[2] Nevertheless, after Charles's departure in 774, the archbishop succeeded in occupying several cities of the Aemilia, the duchy of Ferrara,

[1] Agnellus, *Vita Mauri*, c. 2, 273. (Maurus occupied the archiepiscopal chair from 642 until 671.) The Conductores of the Church of Ravenna in Sicily appear as early as the year 444 in the earliest deed which exists, printed in Marini, *Papir.*, n. 73.

[2] *Cod. Carol.*, liv., in Cenni, li. 322. Both may have borne the title judex simply: the Pope appears to have sent Comites to the smaller places, such as Gabellum. *Cod. Carol.*, li., in Cenni, liv. 335. Papal officials in the cities bore in general the title Actores, a title frequently encountered in documents of Ravenna.

Imola and Bologna, and in driving away the papal officials. He maintained that these cities had been presented, not to the pontiff, but to himself, and stirred up the Pentapolis to revolt. The archbishop, in order to justify himself to Charles against Adrian's complaints, went in person to the Frankish court, from which he returned more audacious than before. He forbade the Ravennese or the inhabitants of the Aemilia to go to Rome on affairs of government. In vain Adrian sent his envoys to the province to receive the oath of fidelity and to demand hostages. The archbishop drove them away by force of arms. At the same time Reginald, formerly Lombard lieutenant in Castellum Felicitatis, but now Dux in Chiusi, seized several of the estates which Charles had conferred on the Church, and even the fortress belonging to it in Lombard Tuscany.[1] The Pope renewed his complaints to the King. His letters, like the greater part of those contained in the *Codex Carolinus*, can be read only with feelings of disgust, betraying, as they do, either undisguised longing for temporal possessions, or dread of their loss. While the increase of temporal power is boldly termed the advancement of the Church, the gain of spiritual welfare is made the reward for gifts of territory and vassals, and heavenly bliss is allied to the sacrifice of earthly possessions. Vulgar passions were hid behind the coffin of a saint, already heaped with deeds of gift, letters, anathemas, and oaths, and worldly

[1] *Cum exercitu in eandem civit nostram Castelli Felicitatis properans. Cod. Car.*, lx., in Cenni, lv. 337. For these letters, which treat of the "rebellion" of Ravenna, see Cenni, 51 to 54.

ambition lurked behind the form of a sainted Apostle, who during his life had never owned the smallest temporal property, and after his death had neither knowledge of earthly affairs nor interest in them.

The Pope did not succeed in making good his claim on Ravenna until 783; but after having vanquished the opposition of the archbishop with the aid of Charles, he was startled by the claims to territorial supremacy put forward by the Frankish King himself. The sovereignty had in nowise been transferred to the Pope; and if this can be proved with respect to Ravenna, much more clearly was it the case with Rome, of which city Charles was Patricius, and where, as we shall soon plainly see, he exercised sovereign authority. The Ravennese appealed from the Roman jurisdiction to the King; the Pope did not prevent them seeking justice in France, but only complained that, although unprovided with a papal letter, the suppliants had been accorded a hearing.[1] In 783 two influential citizens of Ravenna, Eleutherius and Gregory, had been guilty of serious offences, even of murder, and had escaped from the papal tribunal to Charles's court. The Pope implored the King not to grant them a hearing, but to send them to Rome, where their trial would be conducted with the assistance of the Frankish envoys. Adrian's letter betrays the fear that through Charles he will lose some jurisdiction, which, according to treaty, belonged to him in the

[1] *Sed nec nostrae paternitati displicere rectum est, qualiscumque ex nostris aut pro salutationis causa, aut quaerendi justitiam, ad vos properavit. Cod. Carol.*, lxxxv.

provinces.[1] Another instance had already taught the Pope that his royal friend was not disposed to let him govern unconditionally; for Charles had imprisoned Anastasius, the papal Nuncio at his court, solely on the ground of indiscreet speech. He had thus violated international law in the person of an envoy, and been guilty of conduct no less despotic than that of his predecessor, Leo the Isaurian. The Pope affected to consider the arrest of a Nuncio an unprecedented act, and required Charles to surrender the envoy to the Roman jurisdiction. At the same time he reproached the King for retaining at his court Paschalis and Saracinus, two rebels who had fled from Rome, and entreated him to deliver these offenders over to the Roman tribunal.[2]

The Pope was soon startled by yet more formidable demands. In 788 or 789 Charles strove to acquire the right of confirming the election of the Archbishop of Ravenna. On the death of the Archbishop Sergius, Frankish envoys had already opposed the appointment of Leo, his successor. Could we but read Charles's letter, we should assuredly find that he invoked the rights of his patriciate in regard to Ravenna. The title of patrician had, in the course of time, acquired an altered meaning; and if it had been borne by Pipin as a barren distinction, in the conqueror of Italy it had become of itself a right. What could be more natural than that Charles should revive the power of the Exarch, whose place he filled? He wrote to the Pope that

Charles asserts his rights as Patricius.

[1] *Cod. Carol.*, lxxv., in Cenni, lxxvi. 421, *sq.*

[2] This important letter is L in Cenni, lxi.

the dignity of the patriciate would be worthless, could the Archbishop of Ravenna be elected without his sanction.[1] Scarcely had he expressed his consciousness of the rights of the Patricius when the Pope, with diplomatic subtlety, replied: S. Peter also had worn the purple fillet, and to Charles the Patricius, the saint, a Patricius also, now opposed himself. It will already have been observed, with regard to the papal policy, that the Popes always concealed their individual aims behind the person of the sainted Apostle. Did the priests covet territory? The property was not theirs, but that of the Apostle. They wrote, as we have seen, threatening letters to monarchs in S. Peter's name. When they appeared in opposition to princes, it was as representatives of the Holy Apostle, and, did anyone venture to infringe their rights, the offender was pronounced a spoiler of the Temple. In the subtle mechanism of the temporal Papacy, the mythic figure of the Apostle appears as the most powerful lever, and the superstitious dread of a dead saint, whose remains were supposed to lie buried beneath the shrine of his cathedral, formed the actual basis of the temporal power of the Papacy. Adrian spoke in all seriousness of a patriciate of S. Peter, and from this patriciate traced the origin of Pipin's first donation. Writing to Charles, he said: "Since the dignity of your patriciate will always be faithfully upheld by us,

The Pope those of S. Peter in the same capacity.

[1] He must have written to this effect, since Adrian replied: *pro honore vestri Patriciatus nullus homo esse videtur in mundo, qui plus pro vestrae regalis Excellentiae decertare moliatur exaltatione, quam nostra apostolica assidua deprecatio.* This is the first time in the *Cod. Carolin.* that a Pope speaks of the dignity of the patriciate.

and will be raised to still higher honour, so in like manner may the patriciate of S. Peter, your protector, conceded by written deed and in integrity by your father, the great King Pipin, and still more amply confirmed by you, remain inviolable."[1] When S. Peter appeared as competitor, dared Charles refuse him the title? He allowed the question to remain in abeyance. Had he, however, weighed its deeper issues, he would have discovered that the spiritual monarch only regarded him, the secular, as co-Emperor, or as Second Consul, in the government of Rome and the West.[2]

The defenders of papal sovereignty in these ages claim to have a self-evident proof that the city of Ravenna, together with its public buildings, belonged to the Pope, in the fact that in 784 Charles begged Adrian's permission to remove some works of art from Ravenna to Aachen, and that Adrian acceded to the request. The palace of the great Theodoric,

[1] *Quia ut fati sumus* (thus I correct *estis*), *honor Patriciatus vestri a nobis irrefragabiliter conservatur, etiam et plus amplius honorifice honoratur; simili modo ipse Patriciatus b. Petri fautoris vestri, tam a. s. record. D. Pippino, magno Rege, genitore vestro, in scriptis in integro concessus, et a vobis amplius confirmatus, irrefragabili jure permaneat. Cod. Carolin.*, lxxxv., Cenni. xcvii. 521. The letter may belong to the year 790.

[2] Charles laid no claim to the investiture of the Bishop of Rome. According to the Acts of a Lateran Council, the Pope, however, awarded him this right. But this Council, mentioned by Siegbert, *ad Ann.* 773, is a fiction. Mansi, *Suppl. Concil.*, i. 721, and Pagi, *ad Ann.* 774, 13. The statements also of the *Libell. de imperatoria potestate in urbe Roma* (*Mon. German.*, v. 719) with regard to Charles after his arrival in Rome, *fecitque pactum cum Romanis eorumque pontifice, et de ordinatione pontificis, ut interesset quis legatus*, &c., must be referred only to the Constitutions after the year 800.

later the residence of the Exarchs, although fallen to decay, still retained its splendid pillars, mosaic pavements, and marble panels. These valuable possessions were torn from their original site, carried to Germany, and there employed in the decoration of the new cathedral at Aachen, to beautify which many buildings in Rome had likewise been deprived of their costly marbles.[1] But although the Pope was territorial lord in Ravenna, it did not follow that he was unwilling elsewhere and in other matters to recognise the supremacy of the King. When in 785 Charles ordered the expulsion of all Venetian merchants in Ravenna and the Pentapolis, the Pope had his orders immediately carried into effect, although, or rather because, the Dux Garamanus, the Frankish envoy, had sequestrated several estates in the Ravennese territory, asserting that they did not belong to the Church.[2]

The violent expulsion of the Venetians seems to be associated with the traffic which they carried on in slaves and eunuchs. As early as the time of Pope

[1] Eginhard, *Vita Carol.*, c. 26: *Ad cujus structuram cum columnas et marmora aliunde habere non posset, Roma atque Ravenna devehenda curavit.* And the Poeta Saxo, vers. 439:—

*Ad quae marmoreas praestabat Roma columnas,*
*Quasdam praecipuas pulcra Ravenna dedit.*

*Cod. Carol.*, lxvii., in Cenni, lxxxi. 439: *nos quippe—vestrae Excell. tribuimus effectum, et tam marmora, quamque mosivum, caeteraque exempla de eodem palatio vobis concedimus auferenda.* Charles also had the equestrian statue of Theodoric brought from Ravenna to Aachen.

[2] *Cod. Carol.*, lxxxiv., in Cenni, lxxxiii. 459. The Venetians (*Venetici*) there owned *praesidia* and *possessiones*. They were already striving for the possession of Ravenna.

Zacharias it is recorded that Venetian merchants, competing with the Greeks in a highly lucrative branch of trade, bought slaves in Rome.[1] Charles strove to suppress this traffic in human flesh; he wrote to the Pope that tidings had reached him that the Romans had been guilty of selling Saracen slaves. Adrian, however, assured him in reply that nothing of the kind had taken place, but that the godless Greeks bought slaves along the stretches of the Lombard coast, and added that the inhabitants of these shores, reduced by hunger to despair, in many cases had voluntarily gone on board the vessels of the Greek merchants to end their days in slavery. Greeks, like the Venetians, coasted along the Adriatic and Tuscan shores, trafficking in goods and slaves: Venice, Ravenna, Naples, Amalfi, Centumcellae, and Pisa formed the centres of their trade. Adrian had entreated Allo, Dux of Lucca, to seize the Greek vessels in the Tuscan waters, but Allo had refused, and the Pope lamented that he had no vessels at his own command. No Roman navy rode any longer in the harbour of Portus; rarely did even a trader enter the deserted port. The stream of commerce had already been entirely diverted to Centumcellae, the present Civita Vecchia. Rutilius speaks of this harbour, constructed by Trajan, as great and strong; the town or its fortress had played a part in the Gothic war, and in the time of Gregory the Great had been governed by a Comes. Its walls had been restored by Gregory III., on account of the importance of the place, no less than of the necessity of defending

[1] *Lib. Pont.*, n. 222.

it from pirates. Adrian now caused the Greek vessels in its harbour to be set on fire, and the sailors thrown into prison; the Pope thus showing himself sovereign in the country, and indifferent to the anger of the Greek Emperor.[1]

5. Benevento—Arichis attains Independence—Papal War on account of Terracina—Charles's Second and Third Visits to Rome—Expedition against Benevento—Conclusion of Peace—Fresh Donation to the Church—Arichis negotiates with Byzantium—Byzantine Affairs—Settlement of the Iconoclastic Dispute—Grimoald, Duke of Benevento.

Benevento acquires independence.

Of all the Lombard duchies, Benevento alone had remained unconquered by the Franks. Arichis, its present duke, a brilliant prince, was married to Adalberga, daughter of the unfortunate Desiderius, and, with the exception of the Greek cities of Naples, Gaeta, Amalfi, Sorrentum and a few other towns of Calabria, ruled over those provinces which in modern times formed the kingdom of Naples. This fertile land, with its capital, Benevento, the most beautiful and powerful city in the whole of Southern Italy, was protected by its remote position, its size, its alliance with the Greeks, and by the Greek fleet. After the downfall of the Lombard kingdom in Northern and Central Italy, the Duke of Benevento became the natural enemy of the Popes, who zealously strove to effect his overthrow.

[1] *Cod. Carol.*, lxv., in Cenni, lxiii.

Arichis becomes Princeps.

Immediately after the fall of Pavia, Arichis assumed the title of "Princeps," and thereby proclaimed his independence. He caused himself to be solemnly crowned by the bishops of his duchy, donned the purple henceforth, promulgated his diplomas from his "sacred Palatium," and apparently determined to found a Lombard monarchy in Southern Italy. His court became the centre of all the enterprises undertaken by the banished Adelchis for the recovery of his kingdom, for the expulsion of the Franks, and the humiliation of the Pope. A league was formed between Adelchis, Arichis, Rodgausus, Duke of Friuli, Hildebrand of Spoleto and Reginald of Chiusi, into which the Archbishop Leo of Ravenna was initiated. It was proposed to make a general attack in March 776, but the Pope obtained knowledge of the design and wrote to Charles to come and avert the threatened danger.[1] The King satisfied himself by defeating Rodgausus in a rapid expedition against Treviso and Friuli, but while he averted all further danger from this side, plots for a restoration were all the more eagerly woven at Benevento.[2] Landwards, the duchy adjoined the Latin Campania, where Sora, Arpino, Arce, and Aquino formed the

[1] *Cod. Carol.*, lix., in Cenni, lvii. 343, *sq.* : *qualiter—proximo Martio mense adveniente, utrosque in unum conglobarent, cum caterva Graecorum et Athulgiso, Desiderii filio, et terra marique ad dimicandum super nos irruant, cupientes hanc nostram Romanam invadere civitatem.*

[2] After the conquest of Friuli, the Lombard duchies began to be divided into counties; and the provincial organisation and feudal system of the Franks were transplanted into Italy. Leo, *Geschichte Italien's*, iii. 1, 206.

frontier towns; seawards, it extended to Gaeta, which, like Terracina, belonged at that time to the Greeks, and remained under the administration of the Patricius of Sicily. Adrian found himself repeatedly threatened from the latter quarter. The Beneventans had formed an alliance with Terracina and Gaeta (the temporary residence of the Patricius), with the object of together invading the Campagna. They rejected the overtures of peace made by the Pope, but Adrian united the forces of the Church with the troops of Frankish counts and successfully defended the district.[1] The Pope thus, for the first time, appears in the light of a temporal prince, making war and even conquests, since by force of arms he seized the Greek Terracina. Terracina, which, in the days of Theodoric the Gothic King, is spoken of as of some importance, must have already fallen to decay: Adrian speaks of it, although perhaps not altogether seriously, with contempt.[2] He had offered the city to the Neapolitans in exchange for the patrimony of the Church in Campania, confiscated by Leo the Isaurian: the Neapolitans, however, preferred to take it by force of arms, and effected the capture with complete success.

Adrian exhorted the King to call out the whole force of Tuscany and Spoleto, even the "infamous" Beneventans, and, under the leadership of Wulfrin, to

[1] *Cod. Carol.*, lxxxiii., in Cenni, lx. p. 357. The letter is earlier than 781, and Muratori's supposition that it may belong to the year 791 is refuted by Cenni, who places it, instead, in 777. Gaeta was still Greek at this time, although Federici denies it. *Degli antichi duchi e consoli e Ipati della città di Gaeta*, Napoli, 1791, p. 30.

[2] *Cod. Carol.*, lxiv., in Cenni, lxv. p. 377.

send the army to Rome at the beginning of August at the latest, in order to not only recover Terracina, but also bring Gaeta and Naples into subjection.[1] He complained bitterly of the intrigues of Arichis, who had thwarted the negotiations with Naples, daily received messengers from the Patricius, and only awaited the arrival of Adelchis with Byzantine vessels to declare war. Adrian's fears were justified. The son of Desiderius, who relied on the support of Sicily and his brother-in-law's duchy, had been indefatigably occupied in Constantinople in making preparations for an invasion of Italy.

Circumstances thus, for the third time, called for Charles's presence in Italy. He arrived with his wife Hildegard, and his sons, Carloman and Lewis, at Pavia, at Christmas 780, and at Easter (April 15th) of the following year he came again to Rome. The Pope here baptised Carloman in the chapel of S. Petronilla by the name of his grandfather (Pipin), and declared himself Charles's co-sponsor. At Easter he consecrated Lewis King of Aquitaine, Pipin King of Italy; Charles thereby signifying his intention of uniting these provinces in one kingdom.[2] This

Charles enters Italy, 780.

[1] *Ut sub vestra atque nostra sint ditione*, and the oft-repeated *in servitio vestro, pariterque nostro* is not merely a phrase, but denotes the *altum dominium* of the King. The letter seems to have been written immediately before the year 781. The friendship between Rome and Naples lasted but a short time. The epitaph on Caesarius, son of Stephanus, Dux of Naples, contains the lines :—

*Sic blandus Bardis eras, ut foedera Grais*
*Servares sapiens inviolata tamen.*

[2] Some verses in *Dom. Bouquet*, v. 401, deal with Charles's sojourn in Rome; he is here spoken of as Consul. The *Vita Adriani* is silent; it contains, however, two redactions at least, the latest of

scheme, however, shattered the visions of the Popes, for whom the donation of Constantine would now seem to have been fabricated in vain. During Charles's sojourn a fresh treaty, limiting the extent of Pipin's donation, was apparently made with the Pope.[1]

The King undertook no expedition against Benevento, but returned to France by way of Pavia, where Pipin took up his abode. Arichis, who now recognised the Frankish supremacy, continued to alarm the Pope by his connections with the Greeks. Five years passed, during which interval we know nothing of the relations existing between Rome and Benevento, until Charles, in the autumn of 786, came, for the fourth time, to Italy. After having celebrated Christmas in Florence, he proceeded to Rome early in 787. Here not only Adrian's entreaties, but also considerations of his own position as ruler of Italy, urged him to march against Benevento. Arichis, who was now engaged in war with Naples, sought to deter him by sending his son, Romuald, laden with valuable presents, to Rome. Charles kept the prince by his own person, and the Franks advanced as far as Capua. Arichis now threw himself upon Salerno. He found himself, however, incapable of long resisting Charles's forces, and negotiated a peace through the intervention of his bishops. He pledged

Overcomes Arichis, 787.

which gives a minute description of political events up to the time of the fall of Pavia; the contents which follow are frequently merely duplicate abstracts taken from the registers of the churches. *Chron. Laurisham.* *Moissiac. Annal.* *Laurissenses;* and *Einhardi ad Ann.* 781.

[1] Ficker, *Untersuch.*, ii. 348, f.

himself to an annual tribute of 7000 gold solidi, and the surrender of his treasury and his son Grimoald as hostages, and the Franks retired from Capua.[1]

Charles bestows a fresh donation on the Church.

The third Easter that Charles celebrated in Rome presented a fitting opportunity for the bestowal of a fresh donation on the covetous Apostle. Dante, who, although he believed neither in the validity nor the genuineness of his donation, represents Constantine as the founder of the Ecclesiastical State, might with more justice have reproached Charles the Great, since it was the latter monarch who endowed the Church with the greater part of her territorial property.[2] According to Adrian's letters, there can be no doubt that Charles presented him with several towns in the Beneventan territory.[3] The Pope expressly mentions the ancient and celebrated city of Capua: other cities were Teano, Sora, Arce, Aquino, and Arpinum. Nevertheless, it can nowhere be shown that the Pope at any time obtained actual possession of these cities.

[1] *Einhardi Annal. ad Ann.* 786; *Annal. Laurissens.*, 787; *Tiliani* (787); Poeta Saxo. *Ann.* 786. The *Chronicon. Mon. Casin*, i. c. 12, in Muratori, *Script.*, iv., gives the conditions of peace. See, in addition, Mühlbacher, *Reg. der Karolinger*, i. p. 103.

[2] The Roman Church was henceforward like that wolf of which Dante said:—

*Ed ha natura si malvagia e ria,*
*Che mai non empie la bramosa voglia,*
*E dopo 'l pasto ha più fame che pria.*

[3] *Et partibus ducatus Beneventani idoneos dirigere dignetur missos, qui nobis, secundum vestram donationem, ipsas civitates sub integritate tradere, in omnibus valeant. Cod. Carol.*, lxxxi., Cenni, lxxxviii. 475; xc., Cenni, lxxxix. 480; xcii., Cenni, xc. 483. *De Capua, quam b. Petro—pro mercede animae vestrae, atque sempilerna memoria, cum caeteris civitatibus obtulistis*—lxxxviii., Cenni, xci.; and lxxxvi., Cenni, xcii.

According to his own acknowledgment, Charles's envoys only surrendered the convents, the episcopal buildings, and the courts belonging to the State (*curtes publicae*). They delivered the keys of the cities into the Pope's keeping, but forbade him to regard the inhabitants of these cities as his subjects.

This donation was reduced to nothing when, on Charles's withdrawal, Arichis broke his oath of vassalage, again joined forces with Adelchis and sought aid from the Emperor Constantine. The youthful Constantine VI. was the son of Leo IV., a by no means fanatical Iconoclast, who, dying in 780, had left the guardianship of the boy to his wife Irene. This Greek princess had brought from her native Athens to the throne of Byzantium a secret inclination to image-worship, and during her son's minority had found means of re-establishing this worship in the East. In the second Council of Nicea, held in the autumn of 787, the worship of images was solemnly restored, and the same Pope who had freed Italy and himself from the Byzantine Empire, and had summoned the Franks to their common protection, now received a respectful invitation to Constantinople.[1] During half a century the Greek Emperors had fought against the worship of images; little by little the

[1] *Sacra Imper. ad Papam* in Labbé, *Concil.*, viii. 678, &c., in the *Acts of the Concil. Nicaen.*, ii. After the settlement of the Iconoclast dispute, Adrian demanded the restoration of the Sicilian patrimonies. Byzantium, however, remained silent. The Pope complains of this to Charles (Labbé, viii. 1598). The Iconoclast controversy was brought to an end by the Empress Theodora in 842; but the *libri Carolini* of Charles and Alcuin, and the Frankfort Council of 794, expressed themselves decidedly against the adoration (προσκύνησις) of images.

movement, honourable in an age sunk in the grossest superstition, had died away, until the machinations of a bigoted and imperious woman won a final victory. Irene obtained a place in the Calendar of the Saints, but before the tribunal of God stands arraigned as the murderess of her son.

The Empress Irene seeks an alliance with Charles.

The violent struggle, through which Rome had been lost to the Greeks, was thus tranquillised. Italy, however, remained in the possession of the Frankish King, and Irene, in order to render her throne the more secure, sought to unite her house by ties of marriage with that of the most powerful prince in the West. In 781, by means of Byzantine envoys, a betrothal was arranged between Constantine VI. and Charles's daughter Rotrudis; it must, however, have been broken off when Arichis sought to renew the alliance with the Emperor Constantine. The Pope conveyed the intelligence to the King of the Franks and assured him that Arichis had demanded the title of Patricius and the duchy of Naples from Byzantium, under promise of recognising the Emperor's supremacy, and of adopting the Greek dress and having his hair cut in Greek fashion; that the Emperor had already sent two spathars to Sicily to invest him with the patriciate, and that the messengers had brought for the purpose the requisite gold-embroidered vestments, a sword, comb, and scissors.[1]

[1] *Cod. Carol.*, lxxxvii., in Cenni, xci. 488. *Spatarios duos ad Patricium eum constituendum ferentes secum vestes auro textas, simul et spatam, vel pectinem, et forcipes, sicut illi praedictus Arichisus indui et tondi pollicitus fuerat.*

The sudden death of the Duke prevented the execution of this design. The Beneventans implored Charles to give them as ruler Prince Grimoald, whom he had taken away as hostage; and, in spite of Adrian's warnings and entreaties, Charles complied with the request. Grimoald II. submitted of necessity to Charles's behests; he even joined Pipin's troops against Adelchis, who, in the hope of recovering the crown of Italy, according to his former intentions, actually landed in Calabria in 788. The unfortunate son of Desiderius was forced to return hopeless to Byzantium, where he grew old in sorrow, and ended his days as Patricius. The schemes for the restoration of the ancient Lombard kingdom were ruined. Lombard rule only survived in the Dukes of Benevento. Grimoald entered on his reign in the spirit of his father, married a Greek princess, and formed a close alliance with the Byzantine court. But neither his wars, nor those of his successor, Grimoald III., with King Pipin, belong to the province of this history.[1]

Grimoald II., Duke of Benevento.

[1] Erchempert, c. iv. *sq.* Grimoald II. died 806; the sorrowing Beneventans inscribed over his grave :—

*Perculit adversas Francorum saepe phalangas,*
*Salvavit patriam sed, Benevente, tuam;*
*Sed quid plura feram? Gallorum fortia regna*
*Non valuere hujus subdere colla sibi.*

—*Anon.* of Salerno, c. 22.

The epitaph on Arichis attributed to Paul. Diaconus may be read in the *Anon.* of Salerno, c. 16, and in Pellegrino, *Historia Princ. Langob.*, iii. 305. The epitaphs not only of the princes of Benevento, but those also of the Consuls and Duces of Naples (see the same authorities) are valuable contributions to the history of the period.

## CHAPTER V.

1. Condition of the City—Inundation of the Tiber in 791—Adrian restores the Walls of the City, the Aqua Trajana, the Claudia, Jovia, and Aqua Virgo—Foundation of Colonies in the Campagna—Position of the Coloni—Adrian's *Domus Cultae*—Capracorum.

More praiseworthy than his ceaseless striving to increase the newly-arisen Ecclesiastical State were Adrian's efforts for the welfare of the Roman people. He was the restorer and rebuilder of the city, the increased revenues at the disposal of the Church, and the peace which the country enjoyed, providing him with the necessary means.

The city was hoary and antiquated; the churches, the walls, the aqueducts, the banks of the river, were in need of a thorough restoration. In December 791, Rome was again devastated by an inundation of the Tiber. The waters tore down the Flaminian Gate, and carried its ruins to an arch in the Via Lata, known as Tres Falciclas.[1] They further destroyed

[1] *Evellens portam usque ad arcum, qui vocatur tres faccicellas. Vita Adriani*, n. 356. Vignoli reads, probably more correctly, *falciclas*. The origin of the name is unknown. Fea, *sulle Rovine*, p. 380,

the ancient Porticus Pallacinae near S. Marco, and threatened the bridge of Antoninus, now called the Ponte Sisto.[1] Neither the ancient Emperors nor the Popes had been able to impose a check upon the Tiber, and nothing being any longer done to cleanse its channel or dam up its banks, its waters continued from time to time to lay waste the city.

Adrian restores the walls.

Adrian had apparently restored the walls and towers of Rome previous to the year 791. Although this work of restoration had been begun under Gregory III., it had either not been sufficiently complete, or else the last siege under Astolf had seriously injured the walls. Adrian now undertook an entire restoration, when the peasantry of all the patrimonies of the Church, all the municipalities of Tuscany and Latium, and the Romans themselves, were obliged to lend a helping hand and to build allotted portions of the walls. Never since ancient Imperial times had the Eternal City seen such crowds

supposes that it may have been the arch (destroyed in 1662) near S. Lorenzo in Lucina, called, in the Middle Ages, delli Retrofoli and di Portogallo. The *Mirabilia* say: *arcus triumphalis Octaviani ad S. Laurentium in Lucina.*

[1] *Usque ad Pontem Antonini.* I hold neither with Fea that this bridge was the Sublicius, nor with Vignoli that it was the Ponte Quatro Capi (in the Middle Ages, *Fabricii Judaeorum*). The *Mirabilia* give in correct succession: *P. Antoninus, Gratiani, P. Senatorum;* the *Graphia: Neronianus ad Sassiam* (the ruined bridge near S. Spirito), *Antonini in arenula, Fabricii in ponte Judaeorum.* The *Mirabilia* give a *theatrum Antonini juxta pontem Antonini;* and the *Ordo Roman.*, xi. (Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.*, ii. 126), makes the Pope go *ad majorem viam Arenulae, transiens per theatrum Antonini.* This theatre can only have been that of Balbus (near the Cenci Palace). Nibby, *Roma nel* 1838, ii. 588; *Röm. Stadtb.*, iii. 3, 65.

of workmen employed in her service.[1] Rome was again fortified, though no longer so strongly nor so skilfully as in the days of Aurelian. It was these walls of Adrian, with their three hundred and eighty-seven towers, which were seen and counted by a scholar in the beginning of the ninth century, while as yet the Vatican territory remained unenclosed by the wall of Leo IV. We may imagine the many relics of antiquity which now perished in the work of restoration. No Imperial edict any longer protected the ancient monuments: defenceless, they surrendered their marbles, and many fragments of temples and theatres, and portions of priceless reliefs and statues, must have been thrown into the lime-kiln.

Restoration of the aqueducts.

The Pope rendered a no slighter service to the city in the restoration of some of her aqueducts. After Rome had suffered from a scarcity of water for more than two hundred years, Adrian arose, like a second Moses, to satisfy the thirst of his people. We have seen that, with the exception of the Trajana, scarcely any aqueduct had been restored since the days of the Goths. The Trajana, which, beginning at some springs beside the Sabatine Lake (Lago di Bracciano), stretched its course over a distance of thirty miles to the Janiculum, and was known even in Adrian's days as the Sabatina, now lay in ruin for the second time. In order to supply the fountains at S. Peter's and the baths for the Easter pilgrims, the Romans had been compelled to carry the water

The Trajana.

[1] *Totas civitates tam Tusciae, quamque Campaniae congregans, una cum populo Romano, ejusque suburbanis, nec non et toto Ecclesiastico patrimonio.* *Vita*, n. 326, 355.

in casks at a great expense of labour.[1] Adrian restored the Trajana, and, since we assume that the aqueduct had been destroyed by Astolf's soldiery, and since in the life of the Pope it is asserted that it had not been in use for twenty years before its restoration, we may infer that the work was accomplished in the year 775.[2]

The Claudia.

As the waters of the Trajana flowed at the bidding of S. Peter, so did those of the Claudia at the behest of S. John the Baptist. In the eighth century the desire to possess Thermae was regarded as an unjustifiable revival of Pagan luxury. The capital of Christendom had long suffered the extremest dearth of water, but when at length the fonts in the churches were completely empty, the cry arose that the famine was no longer to be borne. Some of the Imperial aqueducts were then restored for God's service, the contents being devoted to providing the Easter fountains outside the churches, where the water was poured on the heads of the newly-baptised, or the feet of the wearied pilgrims.[3]

[1] *Vita*, n. 331 : *simulque in balneo juxta eandem ecclesiam sito, ubi et fratres nostri Christi pauperes, qui ad accipiendam eleemosynam in paschalem festivitatem annue occurrere et lavari solebant ;* a testimony to the antiquity of the ceremony of the washing of the feet. At the Lateran there was a similar bath, probably of ancient origin. *Vita Stephani III.*, n. 271 ; *Vita Adriani*, n. 333. On the subject of the restoration of the Trajana : Alb. Cassio, *Corso dell' acque*, &c., i. pars. 1, n. 39, p. 359.

[2] Cassio, though without any reason, places it in 776.

[3] *Dum vero forma, quae Claudia vocatur, per annor, spatia demolita esse videbatur, unde et in balneis Lateran. de ipsa aqua lavari solebat, et in baptisterio eccl. Salvatoris D. n. J. Ch. et in plures ecclesias in die s. Paschae decurrere solebat. Vita*, n. 333.

The Claudia, the most valued of the Roman aqueducts, flowed from the mountains of Subiaco over a distance of thirty-eight miles, and had been finished on the birthday of the Emperor Claudius, August 1, 52. Its arches so far surpassed all others in height that, according to the expression of Cassiodorus, "its waves fell over the brow of the hills of Rome." After a circuitous course, it reached the city at the Praenestine Gate (Porta Maggiore); and, from its reservoir in the gardens of the freedman Pallas, the Aqueduct of Nero continued its course to the Coelian, where it ended at the Temple of Claudius. Thence, sending its branches to the Aventine and Palatine, it supplied the greater portion of the city. After the time of Constantine it had provided the Baptistery of the Lateran, until the Goths deprived both saints and populace of its streams. It must, however, have been restored to some extent by some of Adrian's predecessors, since, in the biography of the Pope, it is stated that, previous to the time when, repaired by Adrian, it flowed as copiously as in the days of old, it had provided the city with a scanty supply of water.

A third aqueduct, restored by Adrian and called the Jovia, is discovered under the same name along the Via Appia.[1] A fourth was the celebrated Aqua Virgo, which, starting at the Via Collatina, eight miles

The Jovia.

Aqua Virgo.

[1] *Forma quae Jobia vocatur. Vita*, n. 332. The *Anon.* of Einsiedeln notes the name at the Porta Appia; the so-called Arch of Drusus there supported an aqueduct. Cassio decides in favour of the Marcia. Jobia was an actual name, and may have been derived from Jovius Diocletianus; it was probably the Antoniniana, restored by Diocletian, a branch of the Marcia, which had been brought by Caracalla to his baths.

from Rome, reached the city near the Murus ruptus on the Pincio, continued under the hill, and, dividing in canals and on arches, supplied the entire Field of Mars. It had been begun by Agrippa; had received its name from a tradition which related how some thirsty soldiers had been guided by a young maiden to its copious springs. It was known as the Aqua Virgo until the fifteenth century, when it exchanged the name for that of Trevi. Adrian restored the aqueduct so completely as to leave it almost sufficient to supply the whole city, although the Field of Mars, for which it was required, must already have been fairly thickly populated.[1]

The Roman Campagna.

The Pope also directed his attention to the Campagna, which, now safe from the dread of further devastations owing to the overthrow of Lombard rule, might again have been cultivated and repopulated, but for the utter absence of a free peasant class. Churches, convents and hospitals had gradually monopolised vast tracts in the territory belonging to the city. Families of civic nobility still also possessed considerable estates, and even city guilds owned property.[2] The Church either cultivated her own farms, or, as was generally the case, let them on lease to private individuals. Accident

[1] *Formae, quae Virginis appellatur, dum per annor. spatia demolita, atque ruinis plena existebat—noviter eam restauravit*, n. 336. The *Anon.* of Eins. saw its ruined arches in the neighbourhood of the column of Antonine : *forma virginis fracta.*

[2] At present the proportion is as follows : of 362 tenute of the Ager Romanus, 236 are in the possession of secular individuals; 126 in that of churches, convents, hospitals, and religious places. Emidio Pitorri, p. 59.

has preserved the register of the leases under Gregory II. in an abstract drawn up by a cardinal in the eleventh century—a document of priceless value, which acquaints us with the extent of the papal patrimonies, and many details regarding particular sites.[1] The lands were cultivated by *Coloni*, men of half-free condition, who could only be sold together with the soil itself, and were therefore *servi terrae*. They were considered free in comparison with the slaves, although often classed with the latter under the general term *Familia*. According to the condition of the various members of this hereditary peasant class, they received different names. *Originarii*, such as were born on the soil belonging to the landlord; *Conditionales*, those who had to discharge services according to contract; *Tributales*, *Adscripti*, and *Censibus adscripti*, men and their families personally tributary; *Mansuarii*, dwellers in the Massa or Mansus. In documents of the eighth century compulsory services are frequently termed *opera*, *xenia*, or *angaria*; the last word having passed into the language as the term for burden or oppression.[2] Such was the name for the compulsory work, or the number of days in the week which such peasants as had been reduced to the level of day labourers were required to render of their own hands or their

Position of the *coloni*.

[1] In the collection of Deusdedit we find leases to milites, to the Pope's head cook, to notaries, and to women.

[2] Concerning *Angariales*, Marini, *Papiri*, n. xlvi., documents of the year 1027. The position of the colonate at this period can still be explained by the institutions of the Roman Empire. E. Kuhn, *Die städtische und bürgerliche Verf. d. röm. Reichs*, Leipzig, 1864, i. 257, ff.; Savigny, *Ueber den röm. Colonat*, 1835.

own oxen. The dwellings of the labourers were called *casales*, *casae*, *casae coloniciae*, or altogether *colonia*; and *curtis* or farm is a customary expression of the time.

Through Gregory's letters we have already been made acquainted with the general conditions of the *coloni*; and the numerous documents of the abbey of Farfa respecting donations or barters show that the relations of the peasants remained the same as in ancient times. When the farmers of the taxes (*conductores*), or the administrators (*actores*), or, finally, the chief overseers of the patrimony (*rectores*) were upright men, the lot of the *coloni*, on a soil of inexhaustible fertility, was not oppressively hard, in spite of the fact that these men, together with their wives and children, were regarded as fixtures of the estate. Information regarding the administration of justice and the penal code is not forthcoming, and in a barbarous age it is scarcely probable that the peasantry found sufficient protection in the law.[1] More pitiable, however, was the condition of the *servi* (the serfs), who were protected by no right of person. It thus frequently happened that they escaped from the estate, and ran away and hid themselves in the woods

[1] With regard to the colony, see Letters of Gregory I., the *Liber Diurnus*, the papers in Marini, the documents of Farfa, Ducange's Glossary. Canon of rent in Ravenna (Marini, n. 137): *Colonia . . . praestat solidos numero . . . tremisses . . . siliquas . . . in xenio laridi pondo . . . anseres . . . gallinas . . . ova . . . per ebdomadam opera . . . lactis pondo . . . mellis pondo . . .* The archives of Farfa, n. 33 (in Fatteschi, p. 263, A.D. 750), show a donation of Lupo, Dux of Spoleto, to Farfa, where several *coloni* are specified by name.

or mountains; as in earlier times, and until refuge in monasticism had been forbidden, they had fled to monasteries. There are, however, frequent instances of emancipation; the conception of *libertas* endured even in the eighth century, and Roman citizenship was still solemnly conceded to slaves. When private individuals endowed convents with property for the "welfare of their souls," they were frequently moved by motives of compassion to set free their slaves, and no work of Christian piety was accounted more meritorious than that of serf emancipation.[1]

Adrian's *Domus cultae.*

We have already mentioned the erection of *Domus cultae*, the work of Zacharias. These establishments might naturally have been expected to contribute to the increase of population on the Campagna, and to have laid the foundation of villages. Some hamlets indeed did arise, but only flourished for a brief period: malaria and the raids of brigands frequently proving their ruin. Adrian instituted a general redistribution of the patrimonies of the Church, both municipal and suburban,[2] and founded six *Domus cultae.* Two bore the name of Galeria, others those of Calvisianum,

[1] The *chartula manumissionis* in Ep. 12, v., of Gregory I., where the Pope grants liberty to two slaves, Montana and Thomas, developed into the *praeceptum libertatis* of the *Lib. Diurn.*, c. vi. tit. 21 . . . *cumulo libertatis largito, ab omni servili fortuna et conditione liberum esse censemus, civemque Romanum solutum ab omni subjectionis noxa decernimus.* And the testament of Mananes of the year 575 (Marini, *Pap.*, n. 75): *ingenuos esse volo civesque Romanos.* In the eighth century, *Reg. Farfa*, n. 94. Fatteschi, n. xxiv.: *servi et ancillae quos pro animar. nostrar. ademptione liberos dimittimus; ibid.*, n. 97, xxviii.: *Bonosulo clerico liberto nostro.*

[2] Tomassetti, "Campagna Romana," in the *Arch. di Storia patria Rome*, 1878, in the section concerning this Pope.

S. Edistius, Leucius and Capracorum respectively.

Galeria.

The first Galeria, which stood on the Via Aurelia beside Silva Candida, must not be confused with the Etruscan site bearing the same name on the Via Clodia.[1] Adrian's second *Domus culta* (known also as Galeria) was situated beside the twelfth milestone of the Via Aurelia, where a *tenuta* bearing the name Ponte a Galera still exists. It also embraced property on the island of the Tiber, near a monastery dedicated to S. Lawrence.[2] The *Insula sacra*, as Procopius calls it, or *Portus Romani*, is mentioned from time to time in the *Liber Pontificalis* by the enigmatical name Arsis. The ecclesiastical buildings, even the Basilica of S. Hippolitus, once the resort of numerous pilgrims, had fallen to decay, while, even in the time of Adrian, Portus and Ostia, the ancient ports of the Tiber, had relapsed into marshes.

Calvisianum.

Along the Via Ardeatina, fifteen miles from Rome, stood Calvisianum, probably an ancient villa called by the name of the family to whom it had belonged. The territory of the ancient Latins and Rutuli, which in olden time had boasted cities so important as Lavinium and Ardea, was now deserted, and the Pope, anxious to repopulate it, determined to establish a

[1] The tenuta of S. Maria di Galera or in Celsano is held to be the site of one of the *Domus cultae* of Pope Zacharias. E. Pitorri, p. 18.

[2] *Vita*, n. 328 : *Monast. b. Laurentii, posit. in insula portus Romani, cum vineis ei pertinentibus, simulque et lecticarium, quae vocatur Asprula.* Ducange's explanation that the fundus was called *lecticarius*, because it had to be approached on a litter, is marvellous. A college of *lecticarii* (carriers of litters) had existed in ancient times, and to this institution the estate may possibly have belonged.

colony.[1] The site of his foundation cannot be ascertained with accuracy, and even that of the *Domus culta* Edistius remains unknown. A country church of the latter name, which stood at the sixteenth milestone of the Ardeatina, formed the centre of the colony.[2] We have already observed that the Campagna was at this time better provided with country churches than at the present day; and the church of S. Leucius, at the fifth milestone of the Flaminia, served as the centre of one of Adrian's farms.[3]

The most celebrated, however, of all these farms was Capracorum. The district of Veii, the richest in Roman Tuscany, remained marked only by the ruins of Rome's ancient rival, and so utterly deserted that its very name was forgotten, and the Veientine territory in the course of time had become known as that of the neighbouring Nepi.[4] Adrian's parents here

Capracorum.

[1] Several other ancient names appear at this period. For instance, on an inscription belonging to the eighth century, in S. Maria in Cosmedin and in Deusdedit, we find a *Fundus Pompejanus* (the present Mompeo in the Sabina). A *Fundus Mercurianus*. In the leases of Gregory II. a *Campus Veneris*, estates such as *Hostilianum*, *Porcianum*, *Coccejanum*, *Pompilianum*, *Servilianum*, even *Lucretianum* (in the territory of Gabii). On the other hand, the names *Casa nova*, *Cervinariola*, *Casavini*, *Casa simiama* have a modern Italian ring.

[2] The church there inherited three *unciae* from the estate (Massa Aratiana) of the Consul Leoninus. The uncia was the twelfth part of a jugerum, 20 feet long by 10 wide.

[3] This church, dedicated to a bishop of Brindisi, is once mentioned by S. Gregory. It is also discovered in *Vita Benedicti III.*, n. 559, 561, and again, for the last time, under Gregory VII. Its ruins were shown in the eighteenth century near the Torre del Quinto. Galletti, *Del prim.*, note p. 54.

[4] The fundi situated here were named in Vegentano and in

owned a Fundus Capracorum, and out of this fundus the Pope determined to found an agricultural colony, the centre of which was to be a church dedicated to S. Peter. Accompanied by his clergy and the Roman nobility, he came to consecrate his colony. The foundation was entirely his own, and was dedicated to the noblest aims. Its revenues were to be devoted neither to the maintenance of idle monks in any convent, nor to the supply of lamps at any shrine of the dead, but to the exclusive benefit of the poor. The estate yielded corn, vegetables, and wine, products which were stored in the granaries and cellars of the Lateran. The oak woods of Capracorum nourished large herds of swine, and a hundred pigs were yearly killed and taken to the Lateran.[1] The same number of poor daily repaired to the episcopal palace, and, from the blessed products of Capracorum, from the soil of ancient Veii, and the bounty of the estimable Pope, received a pound of bread, a flask of wine, and a bowl of soup. They consumed their meal in the portico of the palace, and could meanwhile contemplate at leisure the representations of similar banquets, with which the walls of the loggia were adorned.[2]

Nepesino. Tomassetti, "Della Camp. Rom." (*Arch. d. Soc. Rom.*, 1882, v. 115).

[1] The breeding of swine, already of considerable importance under the Emperors, was still so at this time. In a diploma of Farfa (Fatteschi, n. xxi.), Theodicius, Dux of Spoleto, concedes to the abbey in 764 the right of summer pasturage for 2000 head of swine: *debeant papulare in gualdis nostris.*

[2] *In porticu—ubi et ipsi pauperes depicti sunt*, the finest ornament of an episcopal palace. The bill of fare is as follows: drink for 100 poor, *decimatas vini duas* (the decimata corresponds to 60 pounds, therefore

Adrian's foundation throve so quickly that it soon became a strong and populous colony. Fifty years after its foundation, Leo IV., desiring to build a wall round the Borgo of the Vatican, was able to impose compulsory service towards the work on the inhabitants. The coloni of Capracorum, that is to say, built a portion of the walls between the two towers, as an ancient inscription, which still exists, tells us.[1] On the tablet the workmen are called militia, a striking fact, since the milites must necessarily have been free citizens. Pressure from the Saracens, however, caused walls to arise round Capracorum, and forced many of the country people to bear arms. Numbers had acquired freedom; free men from the surrounding country had gathered into the town, and had there become burghers; and thus, out of an agricultural settlement had arisen a fortress with its own militia.[2] The tower, court (*curtis*), or the

1½ pound per man) or *cuppam capientum calices duos*, roughly speaking a *foglietta: caldaria plena de pulmento.* Ben. of Soracte says: *pulmentum ex milio factum*, millet broth, *i.e.*, real polenta. With regard to Capracorum, see *Vita Adr.*, n. 327, 328, 339.

[1] HANC TURREM
ET. PAGINE UNA. F
ACTA. A MILITIAE
CAPRACORUM
TEM. DOM. LEONIS
QUAR. PP. EGO AGATHOE (Patron of the militia).

This inscription, which stands high above the entrance from the street, Porta Angelica, near a second inscription referring to the Militia Saltisine, is to be found in Marini, *Annot.*, n. 48, 240. The word Pagina he explains by the façade of a wall between two towers.

[2] The militia of Capracorum forms a rare instance of the transformation of *coloni* into free tenants. The name milites, in the eleventh century at least, was occasionally transferred from the *praesidium* to

fortress of Capracorum (for by all three names is the *colonia* known from the eleventh century onwards), disappears in the thirteenth, leaving no trace in history.

2. Adrian's Ecclesiastical Buildings—Portico of the Vatican—S. Peter's—The Lateran—S. Paul's—Activity of Art in Rome—S. Giovanni *ante Portam Latinam*—S. Maria *in Cosmedin*—The *Schola Graeca*—Monte Testaccio.

Adrian's zeal with regard to the churches almost surpassed that of his predecessors; and the taste for building shown by him and his immediate successors gave architectural embodiment to the first period of the temporal dominion of the Papacy. Adrian entirely rebuilt several churches from their foundation; others he restored; all are enumerated in the long catalogue given in his biography.

Adrian restores the portico of S. Peter's.

To him S. Peter's was indebted for much costly ornament. We already know that a portico, starting near Hadrian's mausoleum, led to the basilica. This portico was entered by a gate (Porta S. Petri in Hadriano) probably close to the mausoleum.[1] The

the *oppidani* (Deusd., *Borgia Docum.*, i. pp. 7, 8). Capracorum is expressly indicated as a fortress. (Marini, note 1 to 48, and n. 46, p. 73; n. 48, p. 81). Coppi (*Capracorum colonia fundata da S. Adriano I.*, Rome, 1838) has traced the history of this place, which he holds to have been Campagnano near Nepi. Marini, allowing himself to be misled by the name Caprarola (near Viterbo), tries to discover Capracorum there. See Tomassetti, "Della Camp. Rom." (*Arch. d. Soc. Rom.*, 1882, v. 137, f.).

At the entrance to the portico stood the church of S. Maria (Traspontina), which must be distinguished from another church

colonnade, following the line of the river, formed the usual, though somewhat narrow, entrance to S. Peter's. Adrian strengthened it by new foundations, a work for which more than 12,000 square blocks of stone were required, and restored the colonnade itself.[1] The similar porticos which led to S. Paul's and S. Lorenzo's outside the walls were also restored by the Pope.

Restorations in S. Peter's.

He further repaired the main staircase of the Atrium of S. Peter's and the two sides of the Quadriporticus, and provided the bell-tower of Stephen II. with huge doors of bronze, taken from some temple at Perugia.[2] Charles presented beams for the building and some thousands of pounds of lead for the strengthening of the roof. The mosaics in the apse, which had already fallen to decay, were restored by the Pope after the original design. He further covered the floor of the Shrine, from the metal balustrade to the tomb of the Apostle, with plates of solid silver, a hundred and fifty pounds in weight; lined the interior of the Shrine itself with gold plates, on which scenes from sacred history were depicted, and overlaid the altar above with wrought gold. The inscription placed on the Shrine by Adrian leads us to suppose that he and Charles the Great

Decorations of the Shrine.

bearing the same name in the Hadrianium; Adrian had raised both churches to diaconates. *Vita Adr.*, n. 337: *unam quae sita est in Adrianio. Aliam—in caput porticus.* Vignoli reads Atriano, and explains it by: *in atrio prope Vaticanum.*

[1] *Vita*, n. 341. Tufi here signify blocks of travertine, and, since these were taken from ancient buildings, it follows that there must have been extensive depredations.

[2] *Vita*, n. 356.

were represented together in relief, in characteristic attitudes. It thus speaks of Christ:—

> Christ grants to Peter's care His sheep, and he
> To Adrian doth the sacred flock commend.
> On His most trusty servants He bestows
> His faithful city's banner, which the king,
> Charles, of all kings the greatest, shall receive
> From Peter's hand, and with it power and glory.[1]

Statues of saints in silver already stood by the Apostle's grave; these the Pope replaced by others of massive gold, representing the Saviour, the Virgin, SS. Peter, Paul, and Andrew. He further restored the entire interior decoration of the basilica with lavish splendour. Tapestries of purple and gold were hung between the columns of the nave on festivals.[2] At Christmas and Easter, on the feast of each of the two Apostles, and on that of the Pope, the huge lamp, known by the name of the great Pharos, or

[1] Gruter, p. 1163, n. 8. The passage runs:—

> *Tradit oves fidei Petro pastore regendas,*
> *Quas vice Hadriano crederet ille sua:*
> *Quin et Romanum largitur in urbe fideli*
> *Vexillum famulis qui placuere sibi.*
> *Quod Carolus mira praecellentissimus rex*
> *Suscipiet dextra glorificante Petri.*

The *Röm. Stadtbeschreib.*, p. 90, as also Papebroch, substitutes *Imperium famulis* in the place of *Pontificatum famuli* given by Gruter. I am in favour of *vexillum famulis*; this is supported by the phrase *suscipiet dextra*, which presupposes a banner. De Rossi, *Inscr. Chr. Urbis R.*, ii. p. 1 (1888), p. 147, substitutes *Patriciatum famulis*.

[2] *Per universos arcus ejusd. Apostolor. Princ. basilicae de palliis tyriis atque fundatis fecit vela numero sexaginta quinque.* Arcus is a careless expression, since the columns in S. Peter's supported an architrave.

lighthouse, was lit. This lamp, which hung suspended from the silver cross-beams of the Arch of Triumph above the Shrine, was also the gift of Adrian, and with its one thousand three hundred and seventy lights well deserved the name bestowed upon it.[1]

Buildings in the Lateran.

S. John in Lateran also benefited by the magnificence of the Pope. Restoring the portico of the existing palace, Adrian erected a tower beside it and adorned it with pictures and marbles. This was perhaps the tower of Zacharias, which at this time probably stood in need of rebuilding. The rapidity with which the Roman churches fell to decay does not speak in favour of the solidity of the architecture of the century; nor did the means forthcoming always correspond to the number of the constructions. The Atrium of S. Paul's had in Adrian's days already fallen into a state of such utter neglect that cattle actually grazed within its precincts. It would thus appear that the entrance to the basilica from the side of the Tiber had already fallen into disuse, and that one of the lateral entrances served in its stead. Adrian caused this atrium to be covered with marble.

[1] Henceforward, S. Peter's was lighted first by this, afterwards by a smaller cross, until the custom was entirely abandoned in 1814. At the time of Peter Mallius (about 1180) 115 lamps were burnt daily in S. Peter's: the illumination on festivals is described by this author in cap. vi. of his *Hist. Basil. Vatican.* In Adrian's time, or soon after, a pilgrim from Salzburg compiled an inventory of the Roman churches, in which he enumerates all the chapels and altars in S. Peter's. This work may be regarded as the earliest description of the Vatican basilica. *Notitia Ecclesiarum urbis Romae*, in *Opera Alcuini*, ed. Froben., vol. ii. t. ii. 597.

To another church he sent twenty Tyrian draperies to be hung between the columns, and no diaconate or titular church remained uncared for by the Pope.[1] Hundreds of artists found employment at his hands. Some worked in gold and silver, some in enamel or lapis lazuli; others pieced together pictures in mosaic, painted frescoes with rough, but not altogether expressionless, strokes, and attempted sculpture, with, however, a smaller measure of success. We have already expressed our doubt as to whether the artists in mosaic in Rome were, as may well have been the case in Ravenna, exclusively Greek workmen. Mosaic art was cultivated throughout the length and breadth of Italy, a fact which allows us to suppose that the country possessed her own traditions and schools. A document has also been preserved from the time of Adrian, which contains directions for the methods of colouring mosaics, gilding iron, writing in gold, preparing enamels, lapis lazuli, &c., and gives instructions for the adaptation of minerals to the uses of art. This remarkable document is framed in the barbarous Latin of the eighth century, and, even if a translation from the Greek, testifies to the degree

Activity of artists.

[1] *Per unumquemque titulum viginti, et linea viginti.* The *Lib. Pont.* enumerates 440, which would therefore give only twenty-two instead of twenty-eight titular churches in the time of Adrian. The *Anon.* of Salzburg mentions only twenty-one churches in the city. On the other hand, from the number of hangings, ninety-six, with six for each church, it is evident that there must have been sixteen diaconates. Adrian created three new diaconates, the two already mentioned of S. Maria, and S. Silvestro near the Vatican.

to which art had at this time become naturalised in Italy.[1]

Tapestries.

The numberless tapestries, on which scenes were depicted in embroidery, were of foreign origin. Their manufacture had arisen in the East, and had been diligently pursued in Byzantium and Alexandria, and the trade in these costly stuffs, so largely demanded by the Church, was carried on through the various Greek ports in Italy. The names of these embroidered draperies and coverings betray an immense variety, both of material and mode of execution, and testify to their Byzantine origin. The words used to specify the different draperies or *vela* are Greek, and are frequently derived from their native place — Alexandria, Tyre, Byzantium, or Rhodes. The same may be said of the white, reddish-purple, or blue fabrics, set with precious stones and embroidered with histories, pictures of saints, or representations of animals, such as eagles, lions, griffins, peacocks, and unicorns. The names also of sacred vessels, known to the Romans under the Greek word *Cymelia*, testify to their Eastern origin. The universal model for these coverings, draperies, and vessels was found in that vast treasure-house of oriental religious splendour, the Temple of Solomon. Popes and bishops strove to imitate the fantastic vestments of the Jewish high priests, and the Church the splendour and use of the vessels with which the Temple had been filled. Golden crucifixes were stiff with gems, blazed with inlaid silver and enamel, while vases, cups, censers, chalices, ciboria

[1] See Muratori, *Antiq. med. aevi*, Diss. 24, from a Codex of Lucca.

resplendent with chased and beaten workmanship, furnish a long list of enigmatical names, alike tantalising and perplexing to the imagination.[1]

Two ancient and remarkable churches owe an added interest to Adrian's liberality.

S. Giovanni a Porta Latina.

Within the city walls, and close to the Via Latina, stands a now deserted basilica, whose mediaeval tower overlooks a wilderness of gardens. This is the church of S. John the Evangelist. Legend relates that the favourite Apostle of the Saviour was brought from Ephesus, where he had destroyed the Temple of Diana, to Rome in the time of Domitian, and thrown into a cauldron of boiling oil. The prophet, however, emerged unharmed from the bath, and the perplexed judges, not venturing to inflict any further torture, sentenced him to banishment on an island. He left Rome uninjured, to dwell in the solitude of

[1] *Vita* of Adrian and Leo III. The purple was called *blattyn*; Eutropius uses *blatteus*, and Sidonius speaks of the Senate as *blattifer*. The insect from which the colour was derived was known as *blatta*. The *vela*, *pallia*, and *vestes* are frequently called after their colour or material: *holoserica alba*, *rosata*, *prasina*, *rubea*, *alythina*, or *de stauracin* (from the *storax* or from σταυρός, embroidered with crosses). They were called *cum periclysi* (with borders), *de blatta ornata in circuitu de olovero* (entirely purple, from ὅλος and *verus*, sc. *color.*), *de chrysoclavo cum historia* (with gold buttons or dots), *quadrapola* (according to Ducange, *auro texta*, at the four corners, *aut serico*, *vel tabulis auro clavatis*); *fundata* (that is to say, *auro texta*, *acu picta*). For beaten metal work we find the word *anaglyphus* or *sculptilis*. Moreover, these technical expressions are very ancient. They are already found, word for word, in the *carta Cornutiana*, the deed of the donation made by the Gothic Count Valila to the church of S. Maria in Cornuta in Tivoli, in the year 471. "Regesto della chies. d. Tivoli," ed. L. Brazza (*Studi e Docum. di Storia e Diritto*, Rome, 1880). The Christian Museum in the Vatican gives but a feeble idea of this ancient art.

Patmos, where the spirit of God revealed to him the secrets of the universe. Greek legend removes the scene of his tortures to Ephesus. Latin tradition, however, places it in Rome, and, as early as the fourth century, a spot beyond the Latin Gate (the gate, however, did not exist in the time of Domitian) was pointed out as the scene of the Apostle's suffering.[1] There, we know not at what time, an oratory had been erected, and the chapel of S. Giovanni in Oleo, a building of the year 1509, still occupies the spot. The date of the earliest foundation of the basilica is uncertain; but its present form belongs to the eleventh or twelfth century. In Adrian's time, however, the church *S. Johannis juxta portam Latinam* already existed, and this church was restored by the Pope.[2]

At this period several Pagan temples still remained in the eighth region, at the spot where the Forum Boarium adjoins the Tiber. Two standing beside the river and the Palatine Bridge still exist, and are known respectively as the Temples of Vesta and

[1] Tertullian is the first to speak of John's martyrdom in Rome. *Martyrolog.*, 6 Maii. The words used are: *ante Portam Latinam in ferventis olei dolium missus est*; so, too, in the *Mirabilia*. The exact expression, *juxta Portam Latinam*, in the *Lib. Pont.*, is changed into *ante*, and the church is still known as *S. Giovanni avanti Porta Latina*, or *a Porta Latina*. Crescimbeni, *L'istoria della chiesa di S. G. a P. Latina*, Rome, 1716.

[2] The festival of the saint on the 6th May is already in the list in the *Liber Sacramentalis* of Gregory I.; and, on this account, it is thought that the church existed on the ruins of the temple of Diana as early as the fifth century. Crescimbeni, ii. c. 1. The district between the Latina and the Appia is marked by the Tombs of the Scipios and the most celebrated of the Roman Columbaria.

Fortuna Virilis. Below the Aventine, and in the neighbourhood of the Circus Maximus, stood a temple to Pudicitia Patricia and several sanctuaries dedicated to Hercules, to whose ancient worship the district was peculiarly consecrated. Here was situated the celebrated Ara Maxima of the demigod. The Christian religion had long since erected its seat opposite the Palatine and Forum, in the churches of Theodore, George, and Anastasia, but had as yet scarcely reached this side of the Forum Boarium. The temples here remained closed, and the adjacent Circus Maximus, in spite of repeated sacks, still retained the imposing characteristics of ancient times. In the ruins, however, of one of the splendid buildings of antiquity a little church had arisen, constructed within the temple in such wise that the columns of the peristyle remained partly unenclosed, as do those of S. Lorenzo in Miranda, which stands within the Temple of Faustina. The remains of the ancient cella may still be recognised in a building adjoining the church on the Aventine, while eight of the fluted columns belonging to the front have been built into the façade.[1]

We do not know at what period this basilica arose. At the end of the sixth century it was already a diaconate, bearing the title of *S. Maria in Schola Graeca*. The name had been derived from a company of Greeks, who had been settled there since ancient

[1] Was this ancient building the Temple of Pudicitia Patricia? Behind it stood the circular Temple of Hercules Victor and the Ara Maxima. De Rossi, *L'ara Massima ed il templo d'Ercole nel Foro Boario*, Roma, 1854.

times. To the Greek community belonged not only the diaconate; the surrounding district bore the name of the *Schola Graecorum*, and, down to the tenth century, the adjoining bank of the river was called *Ripa Graeca*.[1] The name may, perhaps, have been given to the basilica to distinguish it from the church of *S. Maria antiqua* (*nova*, after the days of Leo IV.), which stood near the Arch of Titus.[2] In the eighth century the designation *in Schola Graeca* was alone used, and not until after the date of Adrian's alterations were the words *in Cosmedin* added. The Pope's biographer explains the adjunct by telling us that the church, by virtue of its splendid restoration, justly became Cosmedin (that is to say, ornamented).[3] Since, however, the title was bestowed on a church dedicated to Mary in Ravenna and on another in Naples, it was probably derived from some place in Constantinople; the Greeks settled

*Schola Graecorum*

[1] The *Anon.* of Einsiedeln makes the following distinction on the way to S. Paul's: *Inde per scholam Graecorum, ibi in sinistra eccl. Graecor.* In the *Itinerary* of the same author, *Schola Greca in Via Appia.* In Ravenna there was a *Schola Graeca* about the year 572. Marini, *Pap.*, n. cxx. 185. In Nerini, *De Templo S. Bonif.*, &c., App. i., Diploma of Otto III.: *seu in ripa Graeca, vel in Aventino.* Crescimbeni, *Ist. della Basil. di S. M. in Cosmedin* (Rome, 1715), a work which this custodian of the Arcadia completed by the *Stato della Chiesa di S. M. in Cosm.*, Rome, 1719.

[2] The *Anon.* of Salzburg cites, as churches dedicated to Mary: *Maria Major* (the name by which the church of *S. Maria ad Praesepe* was already known), *Maria antiqua, Maria rotunda, Maria transtyberim.* He does not mention the *Schola Graeca*, because he wrote probably before the date of Adrian's building. That this *Notitia* was compiled in the eighth century, I gather from the fact that the writer was acquainted with the chapel of Petronilla at S. Peter's.

[3] —*veram Cosmedin amplissimam a novo reparavit. Vita*, n. 341.

in Italy having, out of filial piety, revived many of the names familiar to them at home. Ravenna also possessed a S. Maria *in Blachernis*, in memory of a church of like name, built by the Empress Pulcheria in Byzantium, and even in Rome a spot on the Aventine was known as *ad Balcernas* or *Blanchernas*.[1]

Adrian found the church a ruined oratory, with the remains of an ancient temple still towering above it. He removed the huge blocks of travertine[2] and built a basilica with three naves and a portico. This church was restored by Nicholas I. in the latter half of the ninth century, and was afterwards rebuilt by Calixtus II. and other Popes.[3] Probably the beautiful bell-tower alone belongs to the eighth century. It is square and like all ancient Roman

[1] Nerini, *De Coenob. SS. Bonif. et Alex.*, pp. 33, 37: *Monast. S. Bonifacii et Alexii—quod ponitur in Abentinum loco, qui dicitur Balcerna.* The words *in Cosmedin*, *in Blachernis* correspond in Ravenna to S. Apollinaris in Classe, in Rome to S. Giorgio in Velabro, &c. Although the word "in" is used to denote a place or title, as *in Lucina*, *in Damaso*, &c., it is also used at times to denote an attribute. Some churches in Italy are called *in Coelo Aureo* from their roofs; one, in Rome, from an altar, was called *in Ara Coeli*. Charles the Great himself named his palace in Aachen *in Lateranis*, in memory of Rome.

[2] *Maximum monumentum de Tiburtino tufo super eam dependens per anni circulum plurimam multitudinem populi congregans—demolitus est.* The stones were probably made use of for the building of S. Peter's.

[3] An ancient piece of sculpture may still be seen, built into the wall of the portico. It represents a façade of eight arches, with the inscription, as explained by Crescimbeni:

*Honoris Dei et sanctae Dei Genitricis Mariae*
*Pontificatus Domini Adriani Papae ego Gregorius Notarius.*

believe it simply to have been an ornamental arabesque.

towers of the same proportions from base to summit, is a hundred and sixty-two palms in height, and is divided by seven rows of windows, each row consisting of three windows, separated one from the other by a tiny column.[1] In the vestibule some inscriptions in rude characters of the eighth century deserve notice; deeds of gift of the Duke Eustathius, and of a certain Gregory. Both these men endowed the church with several estates, among them with vineyards on Monte Testaccio, and the mention of the celebrated hill, which here occurs for the first time, is our sole object in alluding to these inscriptions.[2] Rising between the Aventine, the city walls and the river, the hill, an artificial pyramid of broken amphorae, thirty-five metres in height, forms a fitting symbol of the splendour, shattered to fragments, of ancient Rome. It is not known at what period this accumulation of broken fragments began, nor the length of time occupied in its formation. The large earthen vessels, out of the sherds of which it originated, must have been used for the transport of products from beyond the seas. The hill, which had not apparently arisen prior to the second century of the Christian era, undoubtedly

First mention of Monte Testaccio.

[1] In Rome the towers of S. Maria Nova (the present Francesca Romana) and of Giovanni e Paolo are of similar construction to that of S. Maria in Cosmedin.

[2] *Item Bineas Tabularum*, 115, *qui sunt in Testacio.* Hills with vineyards in the *campus Testaceus. Tabulae* are measures of land. These inscriptions are valuable monuments of the barbarous Latin of the period. Monte Testaccio is at present surrounded with wine-shops, above which tower the potsherds—a profound picture of human life, which would have inspired the genius of a Horace or a Hafiz.

owed its existence to the neighbouring emporium of the Tiber, in the magazines of which countless amphorae must have been left to destruction. The Romans named the gradually rising hill *Mons Testaceus* or "hill of potsherds," and legend of the Middle Ages ingeniously attributes its origin to the fragments of the vases used by the tributary peoples in bringing their gold and silver to the city.[1]

### 3. Condition of Learning in the time of Adrian—Ignorance of the Romans—Culture of the Lombards—Adalberga—Paulus Diaconus—Schools in Rome—Sacred Music—Disappearance of Poetry—Epitaphs—Decadence of the Latin Tongue—Rise of the New Roman Tongue.

Rome seems at this period to have so entirely devoted her energies to ecclesiastical arts as to have had

[1] Nardini, *Rom. ant.*, iii. p. 320, derived Testaccio from a guild of potters, who, as he assumed, dwelt there; Fulvius and Faunus were of the same opinion. Ficoroni believed that it was formed out of the accumulated remains of Columbaria. Nibby (*Roma nel* 1838, i. 32) believed that it was not of earlier date than the fourth century. Reifferscheid (*Bull. dell' Instit.*, 1865) placed it about the third, and held it to be formed out of the amphorae which filled the magazines of the emporium of the Tiber. P. Bruzza (*Bull.*, 1872, p. 138) agrees with him. H. Dressel ("Ricerche sul Monte Testaccio," *Annali d. Inst.*, 1878) has confirmed the view that it arose on a spot set apart by the city authorities for the reception of broken amphorae. From the manufactory-stamps on the pottery, he was enabled to perceive that the trade in this ware was chiefly carried on with Baetica. The fragments bore the dates of consuls ranging from 140 to 255 p. Ch. Monte Testaccio must, therefore, have arisen slowly and gradually. How far beyond the year 140 its origin may date, we shall only be able to discover when we have penetrated to its lowest strata.

none to spare for scientific studies. The condition of the literary schools, at least, is veiled in utter darkness. The learning of the Roman clergy had undoubtedly long been put to shame by that of foreigners, and the monks of England and Ireland might in their turn have instructed Rome, out of whose cloisters their own had only a short time before been called into existence. After the time of Gregory the Great not a single scholar remained who could have ventured to hold a learned discourse with a Bede or an Alcuin, with Aldhelm or Theodulf of Orleans, with an Isidore or Paulus Diaconus. No Pope any longer strove to emulate the fame of a Gregory or a Leo by the production of theological works, and that Zacharias had translated Gregory's *Dialogues* into Greek was already regarded as a remarkable achievement. Condition of learning.

The monks in the Roman cloisters did not attempt to compete in learning with their brethren in the abbeys of Bobbio or Monte Casino. The Lombards, treated by the Popes as the offscourings of the human race, avenged themselves on the Romans by their cultivation of all liberal arts. Previous to the fall of the kingdom, Pavia was renowned for her learning; the grammarian Felix handed down the treasures of his knowledge to the celebrated Flavian, who, in his turn, directed the genius of his Lombard pupil Paulus Diaconus, a scholar who, as poet and historian, acquired a high renown. The overthrow of the Lombard kingdom was not described by the naïve pen of Warnefried, but it was graced by his intellect; and the fall of the unfortunate

Adalberga.

Desiderius was alleviated by the genius of his daughter Adalberga, wife of Arichis of Benevento, a princess of lofty intellect and a sincere love of learning. Adalberga is the second Italian woman who shines conspicuous in the Middle Ages by her influence on culture. She is also the more deserving of renown, from the fact that she was only succeeded by women of equal endowments in long after ages. While the first four centuries succeeding the fall of the Roman Empire are lighted up alone by two women of German race (Amalasuntha, daughter of Theodoric, and Adalberga), the barbarism of these centuries is but the more clearly revealed by the absence of other women of eminence.

Paulus Diaconus.

Paulus Diaconus, formerly secretary to Desiderius, enjoyed the friendship of Arichis, either at Benevento or Monte Casino, and, at the instigation of Adalberga, wrote the *Historia Miscella,* an amplification and continuation of *Eutropius.* Amid the tumults which convulsed Italy, rhetoric and the writing of history were cultivated at the wealthy court of Salerno and Benevento, the Lombard princess having mastered "the golden sentences of the philosophers as well as the pearls of the poets," and being as familiar with the history of nations as with that of the saints.[1]

Grammarians.

Grammar, dialectics, and jurisprudence were taught in Benevento, Milan and Pavia. And institutions

[1] Paul celebrates the genius of Adalberga in the dedication of the *Hist. Miscella* to the Princess: *ipsa quoque subtili ingenio sagacissimo studio prudentium arcana rimeris, ita ut philosophorum aurata eloquia poetarum gemmea tibi dicta in promptu sint: historiis etiam seu commentis tam divinis inhaerens, quam mundanis.* The sarcophagi of the

for learning must also have still existed in Rome, since in 787, Charles the Great took grammarians and arithmeticians hence back with him to France.[1] Rome, although no longer fostering any native talent, was still regarded as the mother of the seven humane arts. Sacred music alone still flourished in the school, founded by Gregory in the Lateran; the Carolingians here procured teachers of singing and of the organ, or sent Frankish monks to be educated in the Lateran. Adrian allowed Charles to carry off two celebrated singers, Theodore and Benedict, whom the King installed as teachers of Roman Church music, the one at Metz, the other at Soissons. Both men, however, lamented that they could not coax a trill from the throats of the croaking barbarian Franks.[2]

Musicians.

Music, therefore, flourished in Rome under the

princes of Benevento were adorned with lengthy verses. The poet sings in praise of Arichis :—

*Quod logos et physis, moderans quod ethica pangit,*
*Omnia condiderat mentis in arce suae.*

Of Romuald :—

*Grammatica pollens, mundana lege togatus.*

These epitaphs are given in Pellegrini, *ad loc.*

[1] We find in A. Mai (*Classicor. Auctor.*, v. 420), under the *Carmina varia aevi Karolini*, epigrams on grammar, rhetoric, dialectics, arithmetic, geometry, music, astronomy, medicine. They are taken from a Codex of the tenth century, which contains Latin poetry of the eighth. Since in one of them (n. xxi.) Boethius is spoken of as *noster*, it follows that these inscriptions on scholastic buildings were due to Roman teachers. In Tours verses of Alcuin were to be read in the Hall of the Copyists, enjoining the writers to carefulness in their work. J. J. Ampère, *Hist. Littéraire de la France*, iii. 74.

[2] *Tremulas, vel vinnulas, sive collisibiles vel secabiles voces in cantu*

protection of S. Cecilia, but the muse of poetry had been hushed. Knowledge of the profane poets and orators, which was partially revived in the eleventh century, had disappeared after the fall of the Gothic kingdom. True, even after the fifth century some mythographers existed, who compiled and explained the fables of the ancients; but it is doubtful whether they wrote in Rome.[1] After Arator no poet of renown appeared; Homer, Virgil and Horace were better known at the Frankish court than in Rome, and while Angilbert ("the Homer" of Charles) and Alcuin wrote poetry, in which they emulated, not always altogether unsuccessfully, the splendid lucidity of Virgil, the only traces that the poetic art of antiquity was still exercised in Rome are to be found in the funeral epitaphs. The muses led only a sort of subterranean life in this city of the dead, and, themselves dying, dedicated their sighs to the grave. A species of verse, originating in the custom of Christian sepulchral inscriptions, had thus arisen, and had reached maturity soon after the middle of the fourth century, when the talent of Pope Damasus, a Portuguese, enriched the catacombs with graceful verses in heroic metres. These verses, still here and there remaining in their original sites, awaken even now a feeling of sympathy. The most melancholy of all forms of poetry was thus the only

Epitaphs.

*non poterant perfecte exprimere Franci, naturali voce barbarica frangentes in gutture voces: Annales Lauriss.*, A. 787. *Mon. Germ.*, i.

[1] Mai edited (*Classic. Auctor.*, iii.) three Vatican mythographers. Martinus, Bishop of Braga in Portugal, wrote *de origine idolorum* in the sixth century.

one that never died out in Rome, and the monasteries, churches, and cemeteries of the city yield a vast collection of poetic tributes to the muse of the dead. These epitaphs, of which Roman monks or priests were, as a rule, but not invariably, the authors, belong to every period down to the end of the fifteenth century, and with the sixth became sufficiently barbarous both in language and metre. On the death of Cadwalla, King of the Angles, it was desired to frame an epitaph in his honour, but it would appear that no Roman of ability equal to the task was forthcoming, and the inscription had therefore to be entrusted to Benedict Crispus, Bishop of Milan, who strung together the overladen lines with which we are already acquainted.[1] Even the equally long inscription on Pope Adrian, one of the best of the period, was not of Roman authorship; for these verses, characterised by some elegance of diction and greater warmth of feeling, were conceived by Charles the Great, and corrected and improved by Alcuin.

Charles, the pupil of Alcuin in all branches of learning, but instructed in grammar, to the province of which metre and poetry belong, by Peter of Pisa, himself delighted occasionally in writing letters to his friends in verse. Such letters he addressed to Adrian, and the Pope, in his capacity of benevolent

[1] Benedict (who died 725) also composed a *libellus medicinae* consisting of epigrams on the treatment of various forms of illness. Angelo Mai, v. 391. Especially worthy of mark in this age is the epitaph written by the youthful Caesarius of Naples, in memory of his father, first consul and then bishop of the city (788); see Dümmler, *Poet. Latinor. medii aevi.*, iii. 112.

critic, never failed to extol his efforts. "I have," he writes to Charles, "received the excellent and elegant, the mellifluous verses of your royal, illustrious, and consecrated genius, read every verse, and joyfully inhaled its vigorous spirit."[1] Adrian himself, in talent and education the foremost man in Rome, sometimes replied to these courtesies in verse; and specimens of these verses still remain. They take the form of acrostics, and neither in expression nor metre fall below the level of their time.[2]

Decay of the Latin and formation of the vulgar tongue.

The utter decadence of the Latin language in the eighth century is everywhere noticeable. The letters of the Popes to the Carolingians, quoted so often as historic documents, afford ample illustration of our assertion. Issuing from the Chancery of the Lateran, edited by the officials of the Scrinium or Archives, they lay claim to the purest Latinity of which Rome was capable at the time. There is, however, a wide distance between the pompous eloquence of the Rescripts of Cassiodorus and the style of these papal letters, where neither grammar nor logic is any longer evident. Beyond all others, the writings of Stephen III. are remarkable for their inflated phraseology, his incapacity of giving clear expression to a thought being only equalled by the barbarism of

[1] *Praecellentissimos atque nitidissimos Deo dicatae regalis praecelsae scientiae vestrae mellifluos suscepimus versus, quos reserantes atque sigillatim relegentes, eorum robur cum nimio amplectimur amore. Cod. Carol.*, lxxxi., in Cenni, lxxxviii. 473, of the year 787.

[2] This poetic letter is given by *Dom. Bouquet*, v. 403, and Labbé, *Concil.*, viii. 584, as preface to the *Cod. Canonum*, presented by the Pope to Charles in Rome; also in Dümmler's edition, *Poet. Latinor. medii aevi.*, i. 1 (1881).

the language. And when this is the case with the *Liber Pontificalis* and the *Liber Diurnus*, where we have a right to look for the best Roman Latin of the time, we may easily imagine what must have been the character of the language of ordinary life. We may judge of its condition by the documents of the period, whether deeds of gift, judicial acts, sepulchral or other inscriptions. Everywhere we see, arising as from the worn-out vestments of the ancient Latin, the awkward beginnings of the new Roman language.[1] Not a single fragment of the Roman popular dialect has remained to us, and while the Germans and French retain, in the celebrated oath of Lewis and Charles the Bald, a priceless document of the *lingua Romana* and the German language in the year 842, none has survived of the *lingua volgare* of the Romans of that, or even of a later age. We are, however, justified in believing that such a dialect did exist, and that it differed from the official Latin of the notaries. This opinion, however, must be in some degree restricted, since the Latin tongue could nowhere have survived in the mouth of the people longer than in Rome, its mother country; a city where no hostile invasion, nor any incursion of Germans, on a large scale, had taken place. Neither is there any indication that the Romans had the sermons of their priests or the documents of notaries translated from Latin into the vulgar tongue, as was

[1] Cesare Cantù, *Sull' origine della lingua Italiana*, Napoli, 1865, seeks to prove that the Italian language is a natural development of the ancient Latin. This view would be supported by Lyell's theory of transformation (see his book on the *Antiquity of Man*, chap. xxiii.).

the case in Gaul. The already corrupt Latin of the notaries must, however, have become yet more corrupt in the mouth of the people.[1] A Roman of the time of Tacitus could as little have understood the language of the people as Charles the Great the German of to-day, or as we, in the absence of long preparatory study, the speech of our forefathers of his age, or even of the time of the Hohenstaufens. The language of the Romans, obedient to the laws of nature, had suffered a transformation under the influences of time. From the first century of Imperial times onwards, various causes had contributed to this result; the ruin of the rural and city populations, the continual intercourse with the emancipated slaves and foreigners of various nationalities, and lastly, the decay of literature and schools. It is, therefore, a mistake to lay this corruption of the ancient Latin entirely to the score of the invasion of Goths and Lombards, instead of explaining it by the natural process of history.[2] The proud structure of the Latin tongue sank inwardly to decay, as did Rome and other cities, with their temples, theatres and palaces. In reading the archives of the eighth century, we have already before us the ruin of the tongue of Cicero and Virgil, and see the language of

[1] I may refer to the thirty-second dissertation of Muratori.

[2] The mingling of the Latin with the German race cannot be regarded as anything more than a co-operating factor. Lorenzo Valla traces the corruption of the Latin tongue to the Goths and Vandals (he probably meant the Lombards): *nam postquam hae gentes semel, iterumque Italiae influentes Romam ceperunt ut imperium eorum ita linguam quoque* (*quomodo aliqui putant*) *accepimus, et plurimi forsan ex illis oriundi sumus* (*Elegant.*, lib. iii. praef.).

early Roman Christianity gradually transformed by the same spirit of decay. The official and literary language of the eighth century, which alone is accessible to us, appears the perfect image of the city of Rome herself, and of the contradictions between her architecture and forms of life: the majestic mask of antiquity everywhere still towers above the creations of later times. Grammatical incompetence arose from the contradiction of dead and living. The logical laws of language of the ancient Romans had been infringed, and the ancient Latin, the language of heroes and statesmen, with the fall of the Pagan religion, ceased to flow as a vivifying stream. It became torpid and decayed, slowly transformed itself and created new laws,—one of the most remarkable transformations in the history of human civilisation. The transition into the new vulgar idiom was gradually effected by the mutilation of endings, by the rejection of final consonants, which had already become difficult to the tongue and harsh to the ear, by the mingling of the vowels, the exchange of the consonants, and the adoption of the article. The incapacity of maintaining the forms of either gender or case thus already produced, in the literary language of the eighth century, the Italian sounding forms, which, in the tenth and eleventh, attained complete ascendency.[1]

[1] The diplomas of Farfa and Subiaco already present a rich collection of barbarisms, in which Lombard influence is but occasionally detected (as in *gualdus*, *guadia*, *burda*, &c.). The exchange of *b* and *v* (*bictoria*, *cavalli*, &c.) is of older date. Names of cities have already assumed an Italian sound. In documents of the time I find *ad Salerno*; and in Rome *Porta Majore* in the nominative was already

# CHAPTER VI.

1. Internal Condition of Rome and the Roman People—The Three Classes—Organisation of the Militia — The *Exercitus Romanus* — The System of Scholae—Universal Character of the Corporation System — Scholae of Foreigners: Jews, Greeks, Saxons, Franks, Lombards, Frisians.

In the present chapter we shall attempt to give some account of the civic conditions of the city in the eighth century.

The three classes of the people.

The division of the Roman people into three classes: the sacerdotal, the military, and that of the lower ranks of the citizens, or, in general terms, into clergy, nobles and populace, has long been known to us. Clergy and nobles, however, at times ranked together under the head of judices and optimates, in

customary, as *casale*, *quod dicitur castro majore*. From the eighth century onwards, the cases ending in a vowel were readily adopted as nominatives and accusatives: for instance: *Leonem religioso et angelico abbate—per Saburrum vel Germano suo—regno tendentes Francorum —faciens quotidiana missa*—instead of *meo*, *mio* was already used; instead of *ire*, frequently *iri*. The earliest expression in the vulgar tongue, with which I am acquainted in a document, belongs to an epitaph of the year 391: PITZINNINA IN PACE. De Rossi, *Inscription. Christian. urbis Rom.*, i. n. 404.

the same way that the armed citizens were included in the militia, at the head of which we see Romans conspicuous for wealth or illustrious descent. To describe the internal organisation of the city, with respect to these great classes by whom the Pope was elected, is for the historian a most questionable undertaking; and the difficulty of the task is further increased by the confusion which prevailed between the spiritual and secular elements.

In the time of the Goths the Roman Church, like every other episcopate, was restricted to her own affairs, which remained quite apart from those of the city. The city continued to retain possession of her municipal constitution and autonomy, to be governed by the Senate and old-established officials, and judicially administered by the Prefect. The fall of Gothic rule and the terrible misery of succeeding times, without violently putting an end to Roman institutions, effected their practical destruction. For while, in the towns of Italy conquered by the Lombards, the ancient municipal constitution either perished or was transformed through the influence of German elements, the code of Justinian, with the remains of the ancient municipal forms, lingered in the Exarchate and the Roman duchy, which had remained outside the sphere of Lombard jurisdiction. But the ruin of the whole citizen class, as well as the necessity for military organisation (now become the foremost consideration) resulted in the ruin of the ancient autonomy of the city and of her Curia. During the period of Byzantine rule it had been Imperial duces and judices, appointed by

the Exarch, who stood at the head of all municipal affairs; but we have already had to bewail the darkness in which the concerns of the civic government are wrapped at this period, and the gradual extinction of almost all those institutions which still survived in the time of Cassiodorus is all that we can perceive with certainty.

The Roman militia.

Circumstances meanwhile were productive of great changes. Pressure from the Lombards called forth a system of military defence, in which nobles and burghers united in a civic militia; and, during a period of nearly two hundred years, Rome bore the character of a city divided into two systems, the ecclesiastical and the military. All secular institutions, at least, partook of a military character, and such titles of officials as we have been able to discover are, for the most part, simply those of duces, magistri militum, tribunes, and occasionally of comites and chartularii. The weakness of the Byzantine government showed itself in nothing more plainly than in the entire neglect of the organisation of the army. Had the Exarchs been capable of maintaining troops devoted to the Emperor in Rome and other cities, the Greek Emperor would have been able to suppress the aspiring Papacy, and have thus for ever averted the separation of the ancient capital. The Byzantines, however, remained satisfied with the collection of the taxes; in other respects, left the provinces to their fate.

The Roman citizens, fortunately for themselves, were obliged again to take up the arms which they had so long left to mercenaries. In the service of

the Republic or the Empire they received pay from the Emperor, and obeyed the dux or leader set over them by the Exarch. In the first half of the seventh century the Pope exercised no influence on the Exercitus Romanus, as is shown by the revolt in Rome, when the Chartular Maurice sequestrated the ecclesiastical treasury; and later, by the rebellion of the same Byzantine official against the Exarch, who, in the beginning, had received the support of the Roman army. Not until the time of Martin I. do we discover a national feeling in the army, and find the Exarchs beginning to attach importance to its disposition. After this time the purely municipal character of the militia developed further, and represented the political rights of Rome. The avarice and weakness of the Byzantines left the cost of maintaining the army to the treasury of the Church; and the continued contests of the Popes with the heresies of the Emperors strengthened its national spirit. We have already seen, in the first movements of the iconoclastic controversy, how the army appeared in support of the Pope, and aided in the establishment of his temporal power. This Roman militia comprised within it the propertied class of citizens, and only excluded from its ranks the working people and populace. Its leaders (after the middle of the eighth century it was no longer commanded by a Greek dux) were Romans of position, who continued to bear the titles of duces and tribunes, and soon bequeathed these titles to their families. We do not know in what manner these commanders were appointed, but have reason

to suppose that, after the time of Adrian, the officers of higher rank were nominated by the Pope, and that they, according to ancient Roman custom, had the right of appointing their subordinates. Divided according to the regions, and separated into regiments (*numeri*), this militia possessed, beyond its military organisation, a wholly civic character, which gradually served as a foundation for the constitution of the city. It was based on the system of corporations or *scholae*, a system borrowed from Roman traditions which endured and underwent further development during the period of political decline.

The scholae.

The idea of the scholae existed in the time of Diocletian, when the officials of the Imperial Palace, such as the bodyguard (3500 men in seven scholae), were divided according to this arrangement. The expression was originally used to signify houses where people of the same occupation assembled to attend to affairs of common interest, and from the place of meeting the term became transferred to the members of the corporation themselves as scholars.[1] These scholars formed a society, endowed with all the rights of civic association, under their officials, who, according to statute, watched over the affairs of the society. The chief of these officials was called Primicerius or Prior; following him came the Secundus, Tertius, and Quartus of the Schola. The

[1] Procop. (*De bello Goth.*, iv. 27) thus expresses himself: τῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ παλατίου φυλακῆς τεταγμένων λόχων, οὕσπερ σχολάς ὀνομάζουσιν. See Valesius's explanation of Ammianus lib. xiv. c. 7; and Muratori, *Ant. Med. Aev.*, vi. Diss. 75.

schools, in addition, owned protectors called Patrons, influential persons, who served as defenders and advocates of their rights against the government.[1] The military scholae of the city possessed property in common, and could rent property on lease. It is to be observed in diplomas that the expression *publicus numerus militum seu bando (bandus)* is used for the corporation of the militia, while *numerus* or *bandus* denotes in itself the division of the city according to regiments.[2] Each citizen who served in the militia was called *miles*, and, as early as the eighth century, the title was in use as the honourable distinction of the class.[3] At this period, and more especially in towns not subject to the Lombards, the Numeri signified the civic militia, composed of all the citizens capable of bearing arms, which, at the same time, represented the political rights of the citizens. The *Exercitus Romanus*, therefore, soon became identical with the *Senatus Populusque*

[1] In the customary expression of the *Lib. Pont.: scholae cum patronis*, I explain the patroni of the militia as honorary members in the above sense.

[2] In documents of the convent of S. Erasmus, belonging to the ninth and tenth centuries, *publ. num. militum seu bandus* is placed alongside the *loca pia* in the sense of corporation. The barbarous formula is: *qui si filiis, aut nepotem minime fuerint, duobus etiam extraneis personis cui voluerint relinquendi habeant licentiam, excepto piis locis vel publicis numero militum seu bando.* Galletti, *Del Primic.*, pp. 137, 179, 189, 191. The predicate *publicus* belongs to *numerus*, as the following sentence shows: *vel publico numero militum seu bando. Dipl.*, vi. 191; *Register of Subiaco*, p. 140; and Marini, *Pap.*, n. 136. These estates of the *publicus numerus militum* were probably already equivalent to civic communal property.

[3] The Deusdedit Collection calls the Roman citizens milites: Charles the Great himself was miles of the Church.

*Romanus*, and in this capacity exercised great importance in the papal elections.[1]

Roman guilds.

The same system of corporations extended through all classes of the Roman citizens. And although in the documents of the period of which we treat no special mention is made of other associations beyond those of the Militia and Peregrini, Notaries and Papal singers, yet such associations undoubtedly existed. There were at the time associations of the notaries or tabelliones (*schola forensium* in Ravenna), of physicians, artisans, merchants and handicraftsmen of every description. Such societies, called also, after the handicraft, *Artes*, had their own statutes or *Pacta*; the members on their entrance paid a prescribed sum, and swore to observe the laws of the society. A prior or *primicerius* conducted the association, watched over the maintenance of the statutes, and represented the society in its relation towards the State, to which it paid a tribute for its privilegium.[2] The coffers of the society provided for the sick and

[1] Bethmann-Hollweg, *Ursprung der Lombardischen Städte-freiheit*, Bonn, 1846, p. 182.

[2] Papal scholae are alone mentioned at this period; besides the notaries, *vestararii* and *cubicularii*, the *cantores* with their prior (Ep. 35, *Cod. Carol.*). In Ep. x. 26 of Gregory, the soap-boilers of Naples complain that the Greek official appropriates the entrance fees paid by the members of the guild, and burdens the *ars* (now *arte*) with innovations: *adjiciens quoque pactum inter se de quibusdam rationabilibus artis suae capitulis juxta priscam consuetudinem—atque id sacramento—firmatum*, &c. In Ep. ix. 102, Ind. 2, the *ars pistoria* in Hydruntum is mentioned. In Marini, pp. 179 and 343, we find *saponarii* of Classe, and in documents of Ravenna of the tenth and eleventh centuries, given by Fantuzzi, scholae of the *piscatores* and *negotiatores*. Hegel, i. 256.

poor, for the burial of members on their death, and defrayed the expenses of the banquets as in ancient times. The guilds of the eighth century must thus in general have closely resembled the ancient associations. Each guild possessed its church and churchyard, and, as in former times, the colleges of the ancient Romans had each its peculiar divinity, so each guild also had its special heavenly protector.[1]

Among these corporations of burghers the Scholae of the Foreigners (*scholae peregrinorum*) remained isolated. Representing, as they do, the cosmopolitan character of Rome in a barbarous age, they constitute a significant feature in the life of the city. The oldest of all the corporations of foreigners there was that of the Jews, whose history, however, is shrouded for centuries in darkness. From the time of Theodoric, who protected it, it remains absolutely unnoticed for a long space of time; nevertheless, it continued to exist in Trastevere.[2] On the other hand, there is frequent mention of the Schola Graecorum, in addition to which institution there were also Greek convents in Rome.

Scholae of the Jews and Greeks.

[1] The Roman system of corporations is ascribed to Numa. Under the Republic there were eight recognised guilds: the *collegia* of the *fabri aerarii*, *figuli*, *tibicines*, *aurifices*, *fabri tignarii*, *tinctores*, *sutores*, *fullones*, to which the *pistores* were later added. Besides these the *collegia funeraria*. Mommsen, *De Collegiis et Sodaliciis Romanor.*, p. 31.

[2] The Jews first appear as a schola in the twelfth century (*Ordo Roman.*, xii., in Mabillon, ii. 195): this, however, does not prove that their synagogue did not exist at this period. In the time of the Ottos the Jews sang the Laudes of the Emperor, as we learn from the book of ritual, *Graphia Aurae Romae: Dominator—hebraice, graece et latine fausta acclamantibus, Capitolium aureum conscendat.*

Scholae of the Anglo-Saxons.

Four colonies of Peregrini of the German nation had also settled in the Trastevere; the Saxons and Franks, Lombards and Frisians having all founded scholae in the Vatican.[1] The oldest of these foundations was the Schola of the Anglo-Saxons, founded by King Ina, who came to Rome in 727. He here established an institution for the instruction of English princes and clergy in the Catholic faith, and built a church for the benefit of English pilgrims, which was also destined to serve as a place of burial for any of his countrymen who died in Rome. And precisely on this account had the precincts of the Vatican been chosen for institutions of the kind. The throng of German pilgrims became greater with every succeeding year. These wanderers from the north journeyed over seas, rivers, and mountains, through wild and hostile countries, amid difficulties indescribable, until they reached S. Peter's. Many fell victims to fatigue and privation, change of climate and mode of life, and died in Rome, when their remains found burial in the sacred soil of the Vatican. Ina had established the Rome-scot, or a tax of a denarius to S. Peter, on every house within his kingdom (Wessex), for the support of his institution.[2]

[1] *Vita Leon. III.*, n. 372: *cunctae Scholae Peregrinorum, videlicet Francorum, Frisonum, Saxonum, atque Langobardorum.* Greeks and Jews are not specified with these.

[2] Matthew of Westminster, *ad Ann.* 727 (edition of 1601, p. 137): *fecit in civitate domum, consensu—Gregorii papae, quam scholam Anglorum appellari fecit—fecit—ecclesiam in hon. b. virg. Mariae. Ad Ann.* 883, he relates that Marinus I., at Alfred's request, exempted this schola from tribute, and that John XIX., in A.D. 1031, followed the example of his predecessor.

When Offa of Mercia came to Rome in 794 to expiate a crime, he enlarged the foundation, and for its further support imposed the tribute of Peter's Pence.[1] The voluntary gift of a credulous and guilt-laden King grew with time into an oppressive tax, levied for centuries by the Popes on every house in Christendom, but more especially in northern lands.[2] Offa also founded a Xenodochium, out of which, in 1204, arose the Hospital of Santo Spirito, and the name of Santo Spirito was also extended to Ina's church.[3] The entire quarter in which it stood was called in the Middle Ages Vicus or Burgus Saxonum, Saxonia, or, in the mouth of the people, Sassia.[4]

In the same district stood the church of the Frisians, still known as S. Michele in Sassia. Pilgrims of the

Schola of the Frisians.

[1] Matthew of Westminster, *ad Ann.* 794: *dedit ibi — singulos argenteos de familiis singulis.* The same author, in the life of Willegod, chronicles the foundation of the Xenodochium *S. Spiritus: quae schola propter peregrinorum confluxum ibidem solatia suscipientium, versa est in xenodochium, quod s. Spiritus dicitur. Ad quod exhibendum Rex Offa—denarium, qui dicitur S. Petri—concessit.* Franz Pagi, *Brev.*, p. 330.

[2] P. Wocher, *Das kirchl. Finanzwesen der Päpste*, 1878, p. 34, f.

[3] The order of the S. Spirito, however, is not earlier than the beginning of the thirteenth century. Severano (*Le 7 Chiese*, p. 297) erroneously attributes the church to Charles's Saxon followers, instead of to the Anglo-Saxons. Charles congratulated King Offa, in June 796, on his Christian disposition, and assured him that the pilgrims should journey unmolested to Rome. Sickel, *Reg. der ersten Carolinger*, p. 58.

[4] *Quae vocatur Scola Saxonum.* Marini, *Pap.*, n. xiii., of the year 854. The *Martyrol. Roman.* in "SS. Tryphone, Ruspicio et Nympha," says in *Saxonia.* Ina's church was known originally as *S. Dei Gen. Mariae Schola Saxonum.*

race converted by Willibrod and Boniface, coming to Rome, united with the baptised Saxons, and erected a hospice. The church, which was built in the ninth century under Leo IV., stood upon a hill which, in the Middle Ages, was called Mons Palatiolus.[1]

Schola of the Franks.

The foundation of the Franks seems to belong to the same period. The Frankish colony must already have been very numerous, since the close alliance with the Frankish monarchs induced various pilgrims and settlers to leave their native country in favour of Rome. Their church, which was situated on the same side of the Vatican quarter, was called S. Salvator in Macello, or, later, from a great round tower near the present Porta de' Cavalleggieri, del Torrione. It also formed a place of burial for pilgrims.[2]

[1] The title is more probably derived from the Anglo-Saxon quarter than from Charles's German Saxons, as Panciroli (*Tesori*, &c., p. 151) assumes. According to the *Annal. Lauresham. Ann.* 799, Charles dispersed the Saxons over various countries, but no mention is made of any colony being established in Rome. In any case, the Frisians preponderated, the church being called *Eccl. S. Michaelis quae a Scola Frisonorum* about the year 854. Marini, *Dipl.*, xiii. An inscription there, belonging to the end of the thirteenth century, ascribes the building to Leo IV. and Charles the Great, who are here represented as contemporaries. It is more likely, however, that Leo IV. built it to the honour of the Frisians who fell in the attack of the Saracens in 846. A mythical palace of Nero was supposed to have stood on the Mons Palatiolus; this Palatium Neronis was, however, the Vatican Circus.

[2] *Ita est autem ipsa Eccla propter tradendi sepulturas pauperes et divites nobiles et innobiles quos de ultra montanis partibus venturi cernunter.* Thus in the barbarous and spurious diploma of the eleventh century (Marini, n. lxxi.). The title "in Macello" is doubtlessly erroneously derived from the Christians put to death in Nero's gardens. The remains of this church may still be seen behind the palace of the

Schola of the Lombards.

The Lombards also had their dwelling in Vatican territory, either from ancient times, or only after the fall of Desiderius. The schola is mentioned for the first time in the life of Leo III.: the house for pilgrims in that of Leo IV., when a fire destroyed the Saxon quarter.[1] The church of the Lombards was undoubtedly that of S. Maria in Campo Santo, or S. Salvator de Ossibus, the chief feature of which was that it offered a place of burial within Vatican territory.[2]

### 2. Civil Administration of the City—Non-existence of the Senate—The Consuls—The City Officials—The Nobility—Administration of Justice—The City Prefect—The Papal Court—The Seven Ministers and other Officials of the Papal Palace.

If our knowledge of the conditions of the Roman people during this age be restricted in general to the recognition of a military as also of a municipal organisation on the basis of corporations, our information with regard to the municipal constitution and the civil government of the city is still more

Inquisition. In a Bull of Leo IX., belonging to the year 1053, the church is, on the other hand, called *Ecclesia D. N. Salvatoris quae vocatur Francorum* (*Bullar. Vatican*, i. 23 and 25).

[1] *Saxonum, Langobardorum domos, ac porticum concremans. Vita Leonis IV.*, n. 505.

[2] Severano, &c., p. 294, says that this church belonged to the Lombards, and was at first called S. Justini. According to Panvinius, however, *De basil. Vatican*, iii. c. 14, a church named S. Justini in Monte Saccorum had been set apart by Leo IV. as a place of burial for the Italians.

uncertain. Few documents remain to us of the century succeeding the days of Gregory the Great, and the information which we are enabled to piece together from them and the observations of chroniclers leads to results of a negative, rather than a positive, nature.

Extinction of the Senate.

The ancient Roman Senate no longer existed. It is mentioned by no Greek or Roman author after the year 579, and the silence shows that it was as completely extinct as Agnellus of Ravenna tells us. After 757, however, the ancient name Senatus frequently reappears. It is first discovered in the letter written by the Roman people to Pipin after the election of Paul I. It is the Romans themselves who here subscribe themselves as the Senate, and we find indeed the ancient formula *Senatus Populusq. Romanus*, in a sense so altered, however, that the passage affords but a very superficial support to such writers as maintain the continuous existence of the Senate through the centuries in question. No period, it is true, was more calculated to revive the remembrance of the ancient institutions of the Romans than this, when the city, shaking off Byzantine dominion, began to regard herself as head of some provinces. The Senate thus again arose, although only as a recollection and a name. The powerful patrician families, in possession of the chief posts in the Church, the army, and municipal administration, its members invested with the titles of Dux, Comes, Tribune and Consul, again stood forth definitely as an aristocracy dangerous to the Pope; and it was these optimates or Judices de

Militia alone who laid claim to the illustrious name of Senate.[1]

Had the Senate as a college enjoyed continued existence, the title senator would undoubtedly also have been found at this period. Such a title is not, however, discovered in any document; and the papal letters, which speak of optimates, never mention senators. If, moreover, a Senate, as a committee of the aristocracy, had represented the entire body, or had served the Pope as a consulting college in political matters, the senators would have appeared whenever any question of importance concerning the city had to be dealt with; on occasion of a papal election and in business connected with the courts of Pavia, France and Constantinople. In the time of Gregory, however, as also in the eighth century, no

[1] *Cod. Carol.*, Ep. xxxvi., in Cenni, xv. Letter xvi. explains the significance of *omnis senatus: salutant vos et cunctus procerum senatus, atque diversi populi congregatio.* In Ep. xxvi., in Cenni, xl., Paul distinguishes between *universi Episcopi: presbyteri etiam et cunctus—clericorum ordo*, which corresponds to *procerum, optimatum et universi populi—congregatio.* There are many such parallels. Adrian writes (Ep. lix.): *cum cuncto clero, senatu, et universo nostro populo;* but also (Ep. lxiii.) *pro cunctis Episcopis, diversis sacerdotibus, senatu, et universo—populo Francorum.* Moreover, p. 369, *cum nostris episcopis, sacerdotibus, clero atque senatu, et universo nostro populo.* Hence may be explained the passage in the *Vita Adriani*, n. 339, which tells us that the Pope consecrated Capracorum *cum cuncto clero suo, senatuque Romano. Chron. Moissiacen., Ann.* 801: *seu senatu Francorum, necnon et Romanorum coronam—imposuit.* Frankish senators are thus spoken of in *Vita Walae II.*, 561 (*Mon. Germ.*, ii.); in *Domus Carolingiae genealogia* (*Mon. Germ.*, ii. 308). The Frankish poets frequently make use of the title; thus Frodoard, *De Stephano II.* (*Dom. Bouquet*, v. 440): *Tum Rex cum regni Satrapis claroque Senatu*, &c.; or Ermoldus Nigellus (*Mon. Germ.*, ii. 500): *Regibus et Francis coram, cunctoque senatu.*

mention of senators is made. Among the papal envoys to foreign courts, among the plenipotentiaries appointed to receive the surrender of cities, or to determine the limitations of frontiers, we find abbots and bishops, the chief officials of the palace, such as the Primicerius of the Notaries, the Sacellarius and Nomenculator, or now and then a Dux, but in no single instance is there mention of a senator. Neither amid the retinue which accompanied the Pope on journeys of importance do we hear of any official beside the clergy and optimates of the militia, nor even among the suppliants who appeared before him, as representatives of every class in Rome, is there any record of the Senate.[1]

The Roman Senate in its ancient signification is, therefore, to be regarded as completely extinct, and the opinion of such writers as assert that it survived in the form of a municipal Curia, or as a body of Decurions in the eighth century, is not supported by any evidence. The great number of consuls mentioned in the eighth, and still more in later centuries, in the Roman archives, has induced distinguished scholars to discover in these officials the Decurions, or directors of the Senate, a civic college to which they gave the name of "consular."[2] The

Consuls.

[1] We shall see, that on an occasion when the Senate, had it existed, must undoubtedly have borne a part, that is to say, on Charles's election to the Imperial throne, no mention of it whatever is recorded. Where the word occurs in Chronicles, it is invariably synonymous with the Senatus Francorum. Thus the *Chronicle of Farfa* (Muratori, ii. p. 2, 641): *Carolum coronavit—et una cum omni senatu Romano imperium illi per omnia confirmavit.*

[2] Savigny, who maintains the survival of the ancient Curia believes

title Consul, however, in nowise justifies the inference of the existence of such an institution. It was a general custom not only here, but also in Ravenna Naples, Venice and even Istria, in the sixth and seventh centuries, for the Emperor to bestow the title as a favour, or in return for money, and after the middle of the eighth century it was apparently also awarded by the Pope. In proportion as the title of Patricius sank into disuse, that of Consul became common, and at length worthless. We see it bestowed for the last time in 743 on the Dux Stephen, on whom, before setting forth to meet Liutprand, Zacharias conferred the government of the city; and at last it was borne exclusively by Pipin and Charles, to denote their authority as patrons, and their position of supreme jurisdiction. The Romans, however, retained the consular title as an ancestral tradition; the nobles assumed it with the customary adjunct *eminentissimus*; their sons probably continued to transmit it, like the dignity of

"that these consuls are nothing more than decurions" (*Röm. R.*, i. 369); at the same time he distinguishes them from the Senate, which he describes as a college for the administration of the city, from which were appointed the judges of the various districts. He holds that the Senate still endured—a shadow of the ancient Imperial Senate. Leo (*Gesch. Italiens*, i. 191) likewise maintains that the decurions were now called consuls, and that they formed a Collegium (Consulare) for the administration of civic property and of criminal and civil jurisdiction over the citizens. Papencordt (p. 115) holds the same opinion. Hegel refutes it. Even this profound student, however, only comes to negative conclusions. The uncertainty which prevails in Savigny's work is increased by the fact that he groups together all the centuries earlier than the twelfth, while I here exclude everything outside the eighth.

Dux, and it is even found employed for the Roman nobility as a whole.[1] The title Consul appears frequently in Rome, as well as in Naples, in conjunction with Dux; the latter title conferred, however, the more exalted rank.[2] Meanwhile, the consular title became so general that, in the ninth century, people of every rank, but more especially of the judicial, began to adopt it. It further became an official title, so that we find *consul et tabellio*, *consul et magister censi*, *consul ex memorialis*, and, in the ninth century, even *consul et negotiator*.[3]

The city officials.

During the Byzantine period the highest judicial offices and the chief government appointments were in the hands of the Exarch, who sent his Dux as general of the army and regent of Rome and the duchy, and also his Judices "to administer the city." Among these functionaries, we are given to understand, there were special judges as officials of

[1] *Vita Gregor. III.*, n. 192, in the Synod of 732: *cum cuncto clero, nobilibus etiam consulibus et reliquis Christianis plebibus astantibus decrevit.* In the *Vita Agathonis*, n. 142, the nobility of Byzantium are designated *Patricii*, *hypati*, *omnesque inclyti.* Had the Consuls formed a college in Rome, they would have been mentioned in Stephen II.'s letter to Pipin (Cenni, viii.). In the time of Gregory II., however, an ex-Consul Stephanus is spoken of in Rome (Deusdedit, p. 12): a memorable survival of the honorary consulate.

[2] We find for this century *consul et dux Leoninus* in the *Vita Adr.*, n. 332; *Theodatus*, *consul et dux* (*Ibid.*, n. 291). *Theodorus*, *dux et consul* (*Cod. Carol.* in Cenni, pp. 353, 356, 385). In the ninth century the title very frequently appears in diplomas of Farfa and Subiaco.

[3] If, about the year 828, a *Joh. in Dei nom. consul et tabellio urbis* appears (Coppi, *Discorso sul consiglio e Senato*, &c., p. 12), we cannot doubt that already in the eighth century *tabelliones* called themselves consuls. For the ninth and tenth centuries, see a series of them in Galletti, *Del Primicer.*

finance, subject to the Dux, or, in the case of ultimate appeal, to the Prefect of Italy. When the Popes, however, later became rulers of the Exarchate and of Rome, they themselves appointed these officials, sending their actores, or administrators (on whom, under various titles, the judicial power devolved), to Ravenna and the Pentapolis. That the Popes further appointed the chief magistrates in Rome, the judices, the city prefect and the military leaders, cannot for an instant be doubted. When the office of Roman Dux, an office, however, which we find existing in the year 743, had become extinct, the Pope looked on himself as Rector of the city. A Dux is therefore no longer to be found, only Duces, and these officials (who are sometimes mentioned in the eighth century) are frequently, though not always, to be regarded in the light of municipal authorities. Generally speaking, after the time of Pipin the civil government was conducted by judges and officials, who yielded homage to the Pope, as they had previously yielded it to the Exarchs for the Emperor. We still observe, however, that, under this territorial authority of the Pope, Rome remained a municipality if not politically independent, at least self-governing. From amid the elements of her civic constitution which perished in the fall of the Empire, she had preserved seeds, destined to bear fruit in the future, in the militia, the scholae and the guilds, the most important institutions of that period of transition in the municipal constitution of the Middle Ages.

The nobility, distinguished by office, family and wealth, governed army and people as patrons judges, The nobility.

and officers. All influence in Rome centred in their hands; so that the history of the city reveals, more clearly than aught else, an aristocratic rule, associated with the militia and the hierarchy of public officials. The class of the optimates does not appear as a hereditary corporation of patrician families, and, although several Romans could point with pride to a line of consular or ducal ancestors, no trace of the noble families prominent during the later Middle Ages is discovered. The old consular and senatorial families had died out; other families were now coming to the front; and in every case where optimates are mentioned, they are important solely through their office in Church or republic, not by virtue of their family. Their importance as judices of militia was undoubtedly strengthened when, as in the case of Toto, they were also wealthy landowners and ruled over a great number of coloni. While appropriating to themselves all the most important posts, as ministers at the papal court, as patrons, duces and tribunes in the militia, as judices in justice, they probably also conducted the civic administration under the presidency of the City Prefect. For, in spite of the extinction of the Senate, we can scarcely suppose the city devoid of magistrates on whom the conduct of the affairs of the community devolved, and who administered the wealth accruing to the city from property and taxes; nor imagine that Rome existed without a communal council which she herself elected. As, however, after the seventh century the maintenance of her independence rested solely with the civic militia, the

organisation of which alone gave a feeling of power and the consciousness of a common political existence and rights to the citizens, it followed that the leaders of this militia formed the heads of the municipality, while, at the same time, they constituted the civic council. The municipal constitution of Rome at this period can, therefore, be regarded as nothing more than a military-oligarchical organisation.[1]

As to the manner in which the civic magistrates were appointed, we are ignorant; while the administration of the census and the communal property remain as completely hidden from our knowledge as the institution of the aedilician system; and this probably always belonged to the province of the City Prefect.[2] The titles of *Defensor*, *Curator*, *Principalis* and *Pater Civitatis* are unknown in Rome, and only some isolated indications in the archives reveal the existence of state-notaries and chancellors. Such ancient Roman titles are: *chartu-*

[1] The *schola militiae* or the *florentiss. atque felicissimus Romanus exercitus* must also be regarded from the seventh century as the political foundation of the Roman municipal constitution. In much later times an analogy offers itself. After 1356 the Romans instituted a society for defence: *felix societas balestrariorum et pavesatorum*, the heads of which, the *banderenses*, sat in the supreme council of government. In Rome, as in Ravenna, the numeri or militia regiments were divided according to regions; the military, like the municipal divisions, being connected with the territorial divisions of the city.

[2] I have already expressed the conjecture that the estates of the *publicus numerus seu bando* were equivalent to communal property. That the city owned such property is evident from the *Vita Adriani* (n. 326, 355), where the city property is distinguished from the papal: *totas civitates Tusciae—congregans, unacum populo Romano, ejusque suburbanis, nec non et toto Ecclesiastico patrimonio* (namely, the compulsory labour in the building of the city walls).

*larius et magister*, also *consul et magister censi urbis, ex memorialis urbis Romae, scriniarius et tabellio, consul et tabellio urbis Romae.*[1] Stephen, in writing to Pipin, apparently mentioned the chartularii with respect; he speaks of them as next in rank to the duces and having precedence over comites and tribunes. They were officials of the civic administration, who occasionally also acted as judges in the service of the Pope. In the days of Stephen III., one of the most influential men in Rome was Gratiosus, of whom we are told that he "was then chartular and afterwards dux," from which it is evident that he rose from the lower office to the higher.[2] Our information is equally uncertain with regard to the constitution of the ordinary tribunal at

System of justice.

[1] Galletti, *Del Primicer.*, pp. 179, 186, 190, 192, 198. The first *Chartularius et magister censi urb. Rom.*, according to an instrument of Subiaco, belongs to the year 822. Bethmann-Hollweg, who upholds the continued existence of the Senate, sees in this official the President of the Chancery; Galletti, a communal official, who kept the accounts of the taxes, and had charge of the archives of the city. According to the latter author the *exmemorialis* was also custodian of the archives; Documents of S. Maria in Trast., A.D. 879, in Galletti, p. 192, in Marini, n. 136, are signed by Stefanus, *Scriniarius Memoriali hujus Rome*; in the text, however, he terms himself *in Dei nom. consul ex Memorialis urbis Rome.* A *tabellio* of the city (Marini, n. 92) is found as early as the sixth or seventh century, with the statement of his quarters: *Ego Theudosius vh. Tabell. urbis Rom. habens stationem in porticum de Subora reg. quarta.*

[2] In the *Vita Adr.*, n. 302, appears a chartular sent by the Pope to Ravenna: *Anualdi Chartularii tunc ibi existentis civis Romani;* the better reading is *civitatis Romanae.* The *chartularii*, who were held in high consideration in the East, and who wore the gold ring, were also frequently papal judges in Rome, although in the first instance *Chartophylaces*, custodians of the public deeds. Baronius, *Annal.*, viii. p. 26.

this period, the provinces of administration and justice encroaching on each other, while officials of the most diverse nature could be arbitrarily chosen by the Pope to act as magistrates. The judicial system consequently appears involved in utter confusion, and we only know that the City Prefect still remained the supreme criminal judge in Rome, that he corresponded to the Consularis in Ravenna, and that the gravest offences were referred by the Pope himself to his tribunal. We find, moreover, consuls and duces, chartularii, and judices of the palace now and then commissioned by the Pope. All else, however, remains uncertain, since institutions of justice, more especially those of the twofold nature of the Imperial and papal palaces, which were evidently the growth of a later date, cannot be referred to the eighth century.[1] It is, however, undoubted that the ancient system of jurisdiction had fallen with the ancient civic constitution, that the judicial office with which that of the administrative was frequently united, was now in the appointment of the Pope; but the judicial authority was the natural concomitant of certain dignities and offices, so that the dux, comes, or tribune was at the same time also judex in his own sphere.

The Papal Court.

We have, however, much clearer information respecting the government of the Papal Court, with which the affairs of the city were closely interwoven. In the course of time, the Lateran Palace had become the real centre of Rome, the seat of

[1] The *judices dativi* are first met with in Rome in the tenth century.

the entire ecclesiastical administration, and formed in itself a symbol of the contrasts contained in the Papacy. Within the same precincts, in adjoining buildings, the ecclesiastical affairs of every province of Christendom were conducted, beggars were fed, justice was administered and tribute collected: The conception and rules of the Imperial palace had been transferred to the Lateran, the severe order of precedence of the officials and the ceremonial, ecclesiastically modified, had been borrowed from the Byzantine court. In the eighth century the Pope was surrounded by a formal ministry, the beginnings of which may be traced back to the sixth century, although its importance only dates from the foundation of the ecclesiastical state. Analogously to the notaries and deacons, who in ancient times had been allotted to the seven ecclesiastical regions, the papal ministers were also seven in number. They consisted of the Primicerius and the Secundicerius of the notaries, the Arcarius, Saccellarius, Protoscriniarius, the Primus Defensor and the Nomenculator. Although clerics, these officials could not, on account of their secular appointments, rise to any ecclesiastical dignity, but remained in the rank of sub-deacons. Their importance, however, surpassed that of all bishops and cardinals, and, as they were the chief ministers of the Pope, in their hands lay the executive power, and on them the papal elections chiefly depended. Their influence upon all classes of people gave them omnipotent sway.

The ministers of the papal palace.

According to the system of the Byzantine palace,

where all the court officials were divided into schools, the papal ministers appear as heads of the corporations of notaries. First among them stands the Primicerius Notariorum, whose office is mentioned as early as the middle of the fourth century. Originally head of the seven regionary notaries, on him, since the days of Constantine, had devolved the charge of the Scrinium or Chancery. In accordance with his office, he was the first papal minister or secretary of state, and in the vacancy of the sacred chair, in conjunction with the arch-presbyter and arch-deacon, he not only filled the vacant seat, but also actually stood for the time at the head of the government. Next in rank came the Secundicerius or under-secretary of state, and these two ministers were regarded as the most influential dignitaries in the city. On all solemn occasions, such as processions, they led the Pope by the hand, taking precedence of the bishops. According to a fragmentary notice of later times which treats of the judices of the palace, they even appear to rule with the Emperor himself, nothing of any importance being undertaken without their co-operation.[1]

[1] Fragment, *Judicum alii sunt Palatini*, &c., in a description of the Lateran, attributed to Joh. Diaconus (in the twelfth century), edited by Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.*, ii. 570, afterwards by Blume, *Rhein. Mus. für Jurispr.*, v. 129; also in Giesebrecht, *Gesch. der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, i. This notice also belongs to the time of Otto III. Galletti's well-known work deals with the Primicerius. The first Primicerius whose name is recorded is Surgentius, who filled the office about 544; the first Secundicerius Mena, about 536. There was a church named S. Maria del Secondicerio in Rome in the twelfth century.

The office was, therefore, in such demand as to be coveted by the leading nobles and even by nephews of popes; we find consuls and duces raised to the Primiceriate as to a higher, or the highest dignity.[1]

The Arcarius or treasurer may be regarded as Minister of Finance. The Saccellarius or paymaster defrayed from the public treasury the pay of the troops, the alms to the poor, and donations (*presbyteria*) to the clergy. The financial authorities occasionally encroached on the administration of the civic property; the entire tribute to the fiscus, the taxes of the gates and bridges being under the management of the Arcarius and claimed by the papal treasury.[2]

The Protoscriniar derived his name from the scrinium or the archives in the Lateran, beside which the scrinarii took up their posts, and since on them devolved the task of writing the letters and decrees of the Popes, and of reading over the acts of the synods, they acted as the papal secretaries or tabelliones. The head of the schola was the Protoscriniar, and to him the decrees were handed, before being passed to the Primicerius for ratification.[3]

Next in rank followed the Primus Defensor or Primicerius of the Defensors, the head of the body.

[1] Thus, *Theodatus, Consul et Dux* in the inscription in S. Angelo in Pescaria, and *Eustathius Dux* in that of S. Maria in Cosmedin.

[2] *Tertius est Arcarius qui praeest tributis. Quartus Saccellarius qui stipendia erogat militibus, et Romae sabbato scrutiniorum dat eleemosynam*, &c. The fragment quoted above. *Saccus* was the name of the *Thesaurus fisci; Saccellarius* that of the paymaster of the money kept by the *arcarius* in the Arca. Galletti, p. 124.

[3] *Quintus est Protoscriniarius, qui praeest scriniariis, quos Tabelliones vocamus. Ibid*

After the time of Gregory the Great these clergy also constituted a regionary college. Originally proctors of the poor, they became the advocates of the Church, and, as early as Gregory's days, together with the notaries and sub-deacons, were employed as administrators of ecclesiastical property. The administration of the patrimonies consequently lay in the hands of their president; he might be regarded as Minister of Agriculture, and not Minister of Agriculture alone, since everything that concerned the rights of the Church towards the State, the bishops and private persons, and all that regarded the condition of the coloni passed through the defensors into his hands.[1]

The last in the series is the Nomenculator or Adminiculator, the special proctor of wards, widows, prisoners and oppressed, or Minister of Grace. To the Nomenculator everyone turned who had a favour to ask of the Pope.[2]

The general name for these seven highest officials of the spiritual state in the eighth century was Judices de Clero, to distinguish them from the Judices de Militia, duces, consuls, chartularii, magistri militum, comites and tribunes. But as, after the restoration of the Empire, the papal palace became an Imperial Palatinate also, these officials appeared in the twofold capacity of papal and Imperial ministers. Since their jurisdiction was united with their sphere of activity, they assumed, moreover,

[1] *Sextus primus defensor, qui praeest defensoribus, quos advocatos nominamus.*

[2] *Septimus adminiculator, intercedens pro pupillis et viduis, pro afflictis et captivis.*

the titles Judices Palatini, Judges of the Palatinate, and Judices Ordinarii, although, being clergy, they could not act in the capacity of criminal judges.[1] In the eighth century they possessed no jurisdiction outside their own departments, but were nevertheless summoned by the Pope to the execution of various affairs. They principally served him as diplomatists and envoys, but while we find the Primicerius and Secundicerius of the notaries, the Primus Defensor, the Nomenculator and the Saccellarius, the Arcarius and Protoscriniarius are never to our knowledge thus employed.

Beside these seven ministers, there were yet other officials of importance, the special officers of the papal household, with whom were associated various subordinate officials in scholae: thus the Vicedominus or Major-domo, the Cubicularius or Chamberlain, the Vestiarius, and the Bibliothecarius. Next to the seven already mentioned, the Vestiarius was the most influential nobles bearing the title of Consul or Dux not disdaining to accept the office.[2] Not

[1] The fragment is of great importance with regard to the judicial competence of the *judices palatini*, *judices consulares et pedanei*, of which we shall hear more later. According to Niebuhr's conjecture, the number of the judices (seven) served as a precedent for that of the later Cardinal-bishops and German Electors (Savigny, i. 381, *Röm. Stadtb.*, 225).

[2] In a diploma of the year 847 a Pipinus signs himself *Consul et Dux, atque Vestiarius*, a curious accumulation of titles. (Galletti, *Del Vestarario*, p. 38.) With reference to the office of Vestiarius, see Galletti, *Del Vestarario*, Rome, 1758, and Cancellieri, *De Secretariis*, t. i. pars. 3, c. 5. The title was also extended to the wives of the officials; Galletti (p. 46) speaks of a *Theodora vesterarissa*. The office was already extinct in the eleventh century.

only had the Vestiarius, as head of a numerous schola, guardianship of the valuable wardrobe; he was also custodian of the Church property and the jewels deposited in the vestiarium or the sacristy. From a Bull of Adrian of the year 772, it would appear that he was also a judge, the Pope conferring on the Prior of the Vestiarium perpetual jurisdiction in the disputes which reigned between the abbey of Farfa and the subjects of "the Roman Republic," whether the latter were inhabitants of Rome or of other cities, whether freemen or slaves, clergy or soldiers.[1] We further find the title of a Superista of the palace, in the time of Adrian, united to the office of the Cubicularius, and in that of Leo IV. to those of a magister militum; whence it appears the office was purely secular, corresponding perhaps to that of a curopalata in the ancient sense, or of a sacristan who united to other offices the supervision of the household officials.[2]

All these palace officials, with the seven ministers, counted not only as judices, but also as primates and proceres cleri (the praelature of the present day), and to the same list we may also add the defensors, subdeacons and the regionary notaries.[3] On returning

[1] The Bull is contained in the *Exc. Chron. Farf.* in Muratori, ii. pp. 2, 346, and in Galletti, *Del Vestarario*, p. 25.

[2] *Paulus Afiarta cubicularius et superista: Lib. Pont.*, n. 294; and *Gratianum eminentissimum magistrum militum, et Romani palatii egregium superistam ac Consiliarium: Lib. Pont.*, n. 554. The *Superista* later appears to be regarded as the first of the secular magnates. Galletti, *Del Primic.*, p. 18; and, for the ninth century, see also some passages in Papencordt, p. 147.

[3] Giesebrecht, p. 805, and other authorities regard these seven

to Rome from the distant patrimonies of Sardinia, Corsica, or the Cottian Alps, as previously from Calabria and Sicily, the judices made their entry with no less pomp and circumstance than the praetors and praesides, who in former days had administered the provinces for ancient Rome. They associated by right with the primates of the Church, and looked for their reward in promotion to one of the palace appointments. Neither cardinals nor bishops, however, belonged to the judices de clero, the already-mentioned officials of the palace alone coming under that title. We have, therefore, before us a clerical nobility of a hybrid nature, associated at the same time both with the Church and the class of secular optimates. And here also, as with the purely secular class, we may observe that the influence of the nobility was derived from its hierarchical officialism.

### 3. Institutions in other Cities—Duces, Tribuni, Comites—The Ducatus Romanus and its Frontiers — Roman Tuscany — Campania — Sabina — Umbria.

Before closing this chapter, we must cast a glance at the institutions of other towns subject to the Pope, and more especially at the extension of the Roman duchy. In smaller as in larger places, the better part

ministers alone as *judices de clero*. But, having regard to the extended significance of this idea and the actual jurisdiction of the various officials,—for instance, that of the *Vestiarius*,—this view is certainly mistaken. Adrian once speaks of all the palace officials as *servitia nostra*. (Trial of the Abbot Potho, *Cod. Carol.*, 72, in Cenni, 78.)

of the citizen class had formed themselves into a militia.[1] The ancient curial system had perished, and appointments to the higher offices of justice, of administration and the army were either made or confirmed by the Pope. Under the prevailing military organisation the governors of cities and fortresses bore by preference military titles; titles which had originally denoted grades in the army, such as duces, tribuni, and at times comites. These designations are, however, variable, and the papal officials are also called by the general name of actores, an appellation bestowed even upon Frankish counts.[2] Among these actores were included the judges in the proper sense. Adrian, in his letter to Charles, significantly tells him his predecessor had sent the presbyter Philip and the Dux Eustachius as judges to Ravenna "to render justice to those who had suffered violence."[3] This division of government between a priest and a layman is evidence that the layman was alone charged with military affairs: the

Duces.

[1] A *Numerus Centumcellarum* is mentioned in one of the deeds of Farfa in the year 769. Frangipani, *Istoria dell' antichissima Città di Civitavecchia*, Rome, 1761, n. xii.

[2] For this point there is a significant passage, *Cod. Carol.*, liv., in Cenni, li.: *civitates—Emyliae—detinens, ibidem actores, quos voluii constituit, et nostros, quos ibidem ordinavimus, projicere visus est.* Further, *noster praedecessor cunctas actiones ejusdem Exarchatus—distribuebat, et omnes actores ab hac Romana urbe praecepta earundem actionum accipiebant* (that is to say, their diplomas). Ep. lxxxvii., in Cenni, p. 472: *petimus ut per comites vestros* (the Frankish), *qui in Italia sunt actores*, &c.

[3] In the same letter: *judices ad faciendas justitias—direxit, Philippum vid. illo in tempore presbyterum, simulque et Eustachium quondam ducem.*

duces, nevertheless, found themselves invested also with judicial authority.[1] The belief is current, but cannot be substantiated, that the larger towns were governed by duces, the smaller by comites. Under Greek and Lombard rule, duces undoubtedly governed in the greater cities; in the eighth century we still find them in Venice and Naples, in Fermo, Osimo, Ancona, and Ferrara, to say nothing of Spoleto and Benevento. These duces were, at the same time, rectors of the entire territory belonging to the city, and an attempt has therefore been made to distinguish them as *majores* from the *minores*, who did not possess such widespread authority.[2] For since the title dux is no less frequently encountered than that of consul, particularly after the eighth century, it is out of the question to suppose that all who bore the title were entrusted with the government of a city. And, since we cannot quote a single instance in the eighth century of any one designated as dux of a city within Roman territory, the opinion that the larger cities only were governed by duces seems on the whole justifiable. Toto may have been dux in Nepi, but

[1] Hegel (i. 212, 213) opposes Savigny's opinion that the duces exercised merely military jurisdiction, on the authority of a letter of Leo III., belonging to the year 808 (*Monum.* of Cenni, ii. ep. 5): *solebat dux, qui a nobis erat constitutus per distractionem causarum tollere et nobis more solito annue tribuere—unde ipsi Duces minime possunt suffragium nobis plenissime praesentare.* The sale of offices, therefore, still continued, for *suffragium* was the money paid on admission to office.

[2] Muratori dedicates an entire dissertation to this subject. *Antiq. Med. Aev.*, 1, v.: *de ducibus atque principibus antiquis Italiae.* He cannot, however, dispose of the immense number of duces.

the fact is doubtful; he put to death the Dux Gregorius, who opposed his usurpation, and all that we know for certain is that Gregorius lived in Latium. Under the title of Dux, Gregorius undoubtedly governed the entire province of Campania for the Church, since otherwise a new organisation of the now papal provinces must have taken place upon the extinction of the Byzantine duchy. The Pope also sent duces into the districts of Campania, as later into those of the Sabina.[1] In Rome, duces are frequently mentioned, but in no case do we recognise them as governors of a city, nor do we know whether, with the solitary exception of Eustachius,[2] any such had existed. Duces may as probably have been generals as palace officials or judges, and have been made use of in various political affairs. The title, combined with the predicate *Gloriosus*, may either have been bought from the Pope or bestowed by him as a distinction. It might likewise be usurped,

[1] In the *Acts of the Council* of the year 769, we are told that the Dux Gregorius was murdered after the usurpation of Constantine. This dux is called *habitator provinciae Campaniae*, a customary formula in documents of succeeding times; for instance, A.D. 1012: *Roffredo, Consul et Dux Campaniae, habitator civitatis Verulanae.* In this Gregorius I already recognise a papal dux of the Campagna. The office of *Consul et Dux* was transformed into that of *Comes Campaniae.*

[2] The following are named as duces in the city: Theodatus, Eustathius, Gratiosus, Toto's murderer; Johannes, brother of Stephen (*Vita Hadr.*, n. 297); Theodorus, Adrian's nephew; Crescens and Adrianus, delegates for Benevento (*Cod. Carol.*, ep. 92, in Cenni, p. 496); finally, Constantinus and Paulus (*Cod. Carol.*, ep. 94, in Cenni, p. 501). Accused to Charles, the last-named men were recommended to him by the Pope as *duces nostri vestrique* and *fideles erga B. Petri Apostolorum principis vestri, nostrique servitium.*

and, equally with that of consul, may have been hereditary in families, even in the eighth century. Among the titles which in every age it has gratified the vanity of Romans to assume, and with which they still adorn themselves, that of dux was the most coveted; it was flattering to bear a dignity already borne by the most powerful princes in Spoleto and Benevento, and by the rulers of Venice and Naples.

Tribunes

Tribunes bearing the title of *Magnificus* are sometimes mentioned in provincial towns. We have found them in Alatri and Anagni: but in their case also it is impossible to ascertain whether they presided over the government of the city, were leaders of the militia, or bore the title in some other capacity.[1] On no occasion of importance does a tribune seem to have been employed by the Pope as envoy or commissioner. Within the city tribunes as a rule were restricted to their military duties, although, in the seventh century, they were occasionally sent with the clergy to Ravenna as representatives of the army, to bring the Acts of the papal election to the Exarch.

Equal uncertainty prevails with regard to the

[1] Among the registers of leases of Gregory II. are several which seem to belong to Campania or Tuscany; and in one instance the title appears to have been borne by a woman: *Studiosae Tribunae seu Petro jugalibus* (Collect. Deusd., p. 10). The later combination of *Consul et tribunus* is not forthcoming in documents of the eighth century. We found Gracilis as tribune in Alatri; Leonatus in Anagni: *Vita Hadr.*, n. 297; *Vita Stephani*, n. 273. In the *Cod. Carol.*, ep. liv., Cenni, p. 335, a *Tribunatus decimus* is mentioned among the cities of the Emilia, which proves that in certain districts the government was in the hands of a tribune.

Comites: one single instance alone showing that a Comes was entrusted with the government of a town. This was Dominicus, appointed by Adrian in 775 as Comes of the insignificant town of Gabellum.[1] This instance, however, allows us to infer that the government of other fortresses, with civil and military powers, was entrusted to other comites. Comites are sometimes mentioned as owners of estates, or as tenants of patrimonies, and may probably have been officers of the Roman militia.[2] Comites.

We close our investigations with a glance at the geographical limits of the Roman territory, or of that which was still known as the "Ducatus Romanus." We have hitherto delayed making the survey, for the reason that no fixed date can be assigned for the formation of the duchy, and, further, because its boundaries varied from time to time, and not until after the middle of the eighth century can they be determined with any degree of accuracy. Although this territory is mentioned still later, in the deeds of gift of Lewis the Pious, under the name of Ducatus, nevertheless, towards the middle of the eighth century the Popes claimed in its behalf, as we have seen, the name of *Respublica Romana* or *Romanorum*, and the territory was consequently regarded as that on which the Western Empire based its title. The Roman duchy.

[1] *Dominicum—comitem constituimus in quandam brevissimam civitatem Gabellensem, praeceptum ejus civitatis* (that is, the appointment) *illi tribuentes*. He may, therefore, have been equivalent to a Gastaldus. *Cod. Carol.*, li., in Cenni, liv.

[2] *Vita Hadr.*, n. 333: *alias sex uncias a Petro Comite*, &c., and in the Collect. Deusd., p. 11: Anastasius, *Philicarius Comites*, to whom fundi were let on lease.

The Roman territory is still divided by the Tiber into two great halves: Tuscany on the right, Campania on the left. Both divisions are bounded by the sea, and together extended from about the mouth of the river Marta to the further side of the river Astura, towards the Cape of Circe. On the north-east side extended a third tract of territory, comprising part of Umbria and the Sabina. Roughly speaking, therefore, the boundaries were the sea, the rest of Tuscany (*ducalis* as well as *regalis*), and the duchies of Benevento and Spoleto.[1]

Roman Tuscany.

Roman Tuscany consisted of the territory which, bounded on the west by the sea, stretched from Portus on the right arm of the Tiber to the mouth of the Marta. From this point the boundary line can be drawn through Tolfa, Bleda, and Viterbo to Polimartium (Bomarzo) to meet the Tiber, which, flowing from this point in a bend to the sea, is the natural limit of Tuscany. The Via Flaminia, the Cassia and Claudia intersected the province northwards, while from the Janiculum the Aurelia followed the line of the coast.[2] The names which these

[1] I have followed the *Tabula Chorographica* of Joh. Barretta, the most learned work on the subject. The *Geographia Sacra* of Carolo à S. Paulo, *cum notis Lucae Holsteinii*, Amsterd., 1704, gives but little information, and Ughelli's *Italia Sacra*, as also Cluver's *Italia Ant.*, are of more use in the case of single towns than in ascertaining the boundaries of provinces.

[2] The property of the Church on the Aurelia, like that on the Cassia, formed a part of the *patrimonium Tusciae*. Tomassetti, *Arch. d. soc. Romana*, iii. 149. This author quotes *forum Aurelii*, *casale Aurelianum*, *terra Aureliana*, *Aurelianum*.

ancient Roman roads preserve unaltered are frequently to be met with, although the Claudia is already frequently spoken of as the Clodia. The Claudia, having passed Careiae (Galeria) and Foro Clodio, joined the Aurelia-Emilia at a further point.[1] The Flaminia appears thus early to have been known as the Via Campana.[2] The Tuscan lands were Portus, Centumcellae, Caere (now Cervetri) Neopyrgi, Cornietum, Tarquinii, Marturanum, Bleda, Vetralla, Orchianum, Polimartium, Oriolum (*vetus Forum Claudii*), Bracenum, Nepet, Sutrium ; on the right side of the Tiber, Horta, Castellum-Gallesii (Fescennia), Faleria, Aquaviva, Vegentum (in ruins), and Silva Candida.[3] Viterbo formed the frontier town of Lombard Tuscany, and Perusia a separate duchy. In the eighth century Centumcellae appears as a

[1] Recent research has proved that the Claudia started from about the third milestone on the Via Flaminia behind the Ponte Molle, and that the Cassia branched off from it near la Storta. Garrucci in Dejardins, *La table de Peutinger*, p. 132 f. ; G. Tomassetti, "Della Campagna Romana" (*Arch. d. soc. Romana*, 1881, iv. 359). It is, therefore, a mistake to speak of the road immediately after having passed the Ponte Molle as the Cassia.

[2] On the other side of Centumcellae the Via Aurelia is brought into special prominence in this century. By it the *Anon.* of Ravenna (*circa saec.* 7) determines almost the whole of Tuscany, n. xxxvi. *Item juxta Romam, Via Aurelia*, &c. I find the *Via Flaminea que vocatur Campana* for the first time in a document belonging to the archives of S. Maria in Trastevere, A.D. 879, n. 136, in Marini.

[3] The diploma of Lewis the Pious enumerates in *Tusciae partibus :* Portum, Centumcellae, Caere, Bleda, Marturanum, Sutrium, Nepe, Cast. Gallisem, Hortam, Polimartium ; to which are added the four towns lying on the other side of the Tiber, Ameria, Todi, Narnia, and Otriculum, which locally belonged to Umbria and Sabina ; further, *Perusia cum tribus insulis suis, id est majorem et minorem Pulvensim.*

harbour, and Nepe as a country town. Almost all these places were bishoprics.[1]

Campania.

The Tiber separated Tuscany from Campania, by which general name the territory which extended from Rome to the river Silaris in Lucania, and of which Capua was the capital, was known in ancient times.[2] In a narrower sense, however, the Roman Campania only extended to the river Liris and the Cape of Circe. Although, from the time of Constantine the Great onwards, the district had assumed the name by which it is often mentioned in the *Liber Pontificalis*, that of Campania, this district was Latium. The Volscian and Alban Mountains divided it into two parts, the northern of which was intersected by the Via Labicana. This highway, which absorbed the Latina beside Compitum at the fortieth milestone, gave its name to the whole of the surrounding patrimony. The second great road, the Appia, traversed and also bestowed its name on the southern of the two districts bounded by the sea.[3] The smaller

[1] The Acts of the Council of 769 are signed by Petrus of Caere, Maurinus of Poli Martium, Leo of Castellum (Civita Castellana or Castellum Amerinum or Gallesii?), Ado of Horta, the Bishop of Centumcellae, Bonus of Manturianum, Gregorius of Silva Candida, Potho of Nepi, and Cidonatus of Portus.

[2] This is the explanation of Paulus Diaconus, *De gest. Lang.*, ii. c. 17. Camill. Peregrinus, *Antiq. Capuae*, p. 77; and, following him, Domin. Georgius, *De antiq. Italiae Metropolibus* (Rome, 1722), c. vii. 88, believe that, from the time of Gregory I., Campania was divided into two parts: Romana, which stretched from the city as far as Terracina, and Capuana with Capua as its capital. There is no doubt that in the eighth century the ancient Latium was named Campania.

[3] The Book of the Pilgrims at the end of the *Opera Alcuini* says that by the Via Appia *pervenitur ad Albanam civitatem.*

Roman roads, such as the Ostiensis and Ardeatina, still remained. Of the ancient cities in the southern part of Campania, the present Maritima, many had vanished or become deserted even in the eighth century; such, for example, were Ostia, Laurentum (now Torre Paterno), Lavinium (Prattica), Ardea, Aphrodisium and Antium, which is represented by its bishop in the Roman Councils of 499, 501, and 502, but henceforward disappears from history until the eighth century. Astura also, although remaining unnoticed during this period, still survived.[1] With the exception of Ostia, no bishop is mentioned in connection with any of these places.

The boundary of the duchy was at Terracina, which, like Caieta, had remained in the possession of the Patriciate of Sicily. The Roman frontiers are, however, very uncertain here, and it is only from the established idea, in accordance with which Procopius asserts the Roman Campania properly speaking to have stretched as far as Terracina, that we conclude the duchy must also have extended to this point.[2] It is a striking fact that neither in the later diploma of Lewis the Pious, nor in that of Otto, is there the slightest mention of any single place in the present Maritima. The northern district between the Volscian

[1] When the *Anon. Ravenn.* cites: Circellis, Turres Albas, Clostris, Asturas, Antium, Lavinium, Ostia Tiberina, he is making use of the ancient geographers, which means as much for that time as when he names: Stabium, Sarnum, Pompeii, Oplontis, Herculanum. Antium survived with its principal church, S. Hermes, and Astura is found again in a diploma of the tenth century, in Nerini, *App.*, 382

[2] Procopius, *de Bell. Goth.*, i. 15: μεθ' οὓς Καμπανοὶ ἄχρι εἰς Ταρακήνην πόλιν οἰκοῦσιν, οὓς δὴ οἱ Ῥώμης ὅροι ἐκδέχονται.

Mountains and the Apennines is alone spoken of as Campania, while neither the episcopal city of Albano, nor Velletri, Cori, nor Trestabernae are named.[1] And although these cities are frequently mentioned in the history of the bishoprics after the time of Gregory, it is never in connection with political matters. This silence is explicable with regard to the greater number; with others it is probably merely accidental. It is, however, quite impossible that either the Duke of Benevento or that of Spoleto or the Patricius of Sicily could have extended his dominions as far as Albano without conflicts having arisen during the iconoclastic struggle between these cities and Rome. Such conflicts are already known to us at Terracina, as also further north at Sora, Arce, and other places on the frontier.[2] The absence of history in these centuries with regard to the present Maritima is accounted for by the insignificance of its towns, the state of decay into which they had fallen, and yet more by the desertion of the coast and the Pontine

[1] Tres Tabernae was an ancient bishopric; in the *Acts of the Synod of Symmachus*, i. (499), there is mentioned: *Decius Trium Tabernarum*. A. Thiel, *Ep. R. Pont.*, i. 642.

[2] Borgia is the first to express surprise at the silence maintained concerning these places. *Breve Istoria*, &c., p. 288 *sq.* He is of opinion that the Roman duchy comprised the present Campania, but not the Maritima; and the donation of Norma and Ninfa seems to strengthen his supposition. The diploma of Lewis the Pious, however, is silent regarding Ostia, which nevertheless belonged to the duchy. In the Council of 769 we find the names of Eustathius of Albano and Pinus of Tres Tabernae (the latter bishopric had previously been united with that of Velletri by Gregory I.); also Bonifacius, Bishop of Privernum in the Volscian Mountains; but neither Cora, Sulmo (Sermoneta), nor yet Setia is mentioned.

marshes from Velletri to Terracina, with the fact that the Via Appia had become useless as a military road. On the other hand, the Latin territory had attained a greater prominence, owing to the importance of its towns and the vigour of its sturdy mountain population, and was called by preference Campania.[1] It extended as far as the Liris, where, in modern times, Ceprano marked the boundary of the ecclesiastical state, and comprised within it the now considerable episcopal cities of Praeneste, Anagnia, Alatrium, Verola, Signia, Patricum, Ferentinum and Frusino.[2] Beyond the Liris the duchy seems further to have stretched to Horrea, an unknown place. Although in the seventh century we have already spoken of the frontier towns of Arpinum, Arx, Sora, and Aquinum as occupied by the Lombard Duke of Benevento, but claimed by Adrian, it is nevertheless impossible to define the boundaries on this side with accuracy.[3]

Sabina.

While the limits of the Roman Campania were marked on the north by the Anio, the land which lay between this river and the Tiber was divided into the Sabina and Umbria. The Sabine territory was bounded westwards by the Tiber, southwards by the

[1] Hence in the *Dipl. Ludovici Pii: in partibus Campaniae Signiam, Anagniam, Ferentinum, Alatrum, Patricum, Frisilinam (Frosinone) cum omnibus finibus Campaniae.*

[2] The following bishops subscribed their names in 769: Sergius of Ferentinum, Jordanus of Signia, Nirgotius of Anagnia, and an unnamed bishop of Alatri.

[3] We may hold with Barretta that the frontier was formed by the river Melphis, on the other side of the Liris; this, however, is merely a hypothesis.

Anio, towards the north by the rivers Nar and Velinus, and on the east by Abrutium Ulterius. The Sabina therefore adjoined Roman Tuscany, Latium or Campania, and Umbria, and was separated from them by the Tiber, the Anio, and the Nar respectively. The greater part of the province was the property of the Duke of Spoleto, whose territory stretched from the brook Allia at the fourteenth milestone beyond the Salarian Gate over Monte Rotondo (Eretum), Farfa and the ancient Cures to the territory of Rieti.[1] To the Roman duchy belonged the following celebrated Sabine towns: Fidenae, Nomentum, Gabii, Asperia, Ocricolum, and Narnia.[2] Other Sabine towns, even in the immediate neighbourhood of Rome, had perished under the successive incursions of the Lombard dukes, or only endured as ruins. Eretum, Crustmeria, Fidenae, Gabii, Ficulea, Antemnae gradually sank and disappeared.[3] Even Cures, the birthplace of Numa and Ancus Martius,

[1] Fatteschi (*Memorie*, &c., pp. 130, 131) asserts that the actual Sabina began at the brook Allia, *non Romana, ma Longobardica*. Cures, formerly the Sabine capital, is still mentioned by Gregory (Ep. 20, lib. ii.) (*in Curium Sabinorum territorio*). It had already fallen to decay, and the Pope therefore united the bishopric with that of Nomentum. Malliano (Manlianum) is now the chief town of the province. The diocese of the Sabina, the richest of the dioceses, comprises fifty places, enumerated by Ughelli, i. 156.

[2] Barretta, n. 110; Eschinardi, *Del Agro Romano*, p. 229; Ughelli, *Ital. Sac.*, i. p. 154 *sq.* The industrious Fatteschi, *Memorie de' duchi di Spoleto*, gives a description of the Sabina, pp. 127–159; but Sperandio's *Sabina Sacra* has, on the whole, afforded me but little assistance.

[3] Gabii, although remaining the seat of a bishop, had sunk to the level of a fundus as early as 741. A bishop of Fidenae is mentioned for the last time in 680. Nibby's *Analisi*, on these places.

which in olden days had given the word Quirites to the Romans, perished in Lombard times, its memory merely lingering in the name of the hamlet "Correse." Nomentum alone existed as a bishopric until the tenth century. The limits of the duchy were formed at Narni by the river Nar, on the other side of which lay Umbria; and here, as we have already seen, the towns of Ameria and Tuder (Todi) were politically reckoned as belonging to Roman Tuscany. Three main roads still bore their ancient names, and led through the Sabine territory; the Tiburtina, which was known from the twentieth milestone onwards as Valeria, followed the course of the Anio as far as Alba; the Nomentana, and thirdly, the Salaria which was joined by the Nomentana at Nomentum. Umbria.

## CHAPTER VII.

1. Death of Adrian, 795—Leo III. Pope—His Embassy to Charles—Charles's Treaty with the Church—Symbolical Significance of the Keys of the Apostle's Grave and the Roman Banner—Supreme Jurisdiction exercised by Charles as Patricius—Representation of the Harmony between the Spiritual and Temporal Power—Mosaics in S. Susanna, and in the Triclinium of Leo III.

Adrian I. died after a glorious reign of more than twenty-three years, on Christmas Day, 795. The news of his death affected Charles profoundly. The two men were the most prominent characters of the age; into their hands destiny had entrusted a great task, and the consciousness of their mission and long intercourse had made them friends. In Adrian's attitude towards Charles was manifested, for the first time in the West, the mutual interdependence of Church and State, powers which, under the Greek Empire, had been at open enmity with each other. The Roman Church, having shaken off the yoke of Byzantine Imperialism, could now unite as an independent power with the growing Western Empire,

at the head of which stood the Frankish King. Charles honoured the memory of his friend by the solemnisation of masses for his soul, by the distribution of alms in every province of his kingdom, and by an inscription in gold letters on black marble, which he placed over Adrian's tomb in S. Peter's This inscription, which still exists, is built into the wall on the left of the main entrance in the vestibule of the basilica.[1]

The unanimous choice of the Romans fell on the Cardinal-presbyter of S. Susanna, who received consecration as Leo III. on December 27. The haste with which the election was accomplished shows it to have been the independent and uninfluenced work of the clergy. The new Pope, the son of Azuppius, was a Roman by birth, had been brought up from childhood in the Lateran, and had risen to the highest offices of the Church. The successor of Adrian, at a time so momentous, ought indeed to have been a man of no ordinary mould.

No sooner was Leo raised to the apostolic chair than he notified to the Patricius of the Romans the death of his predecessor and his own elevation. The letter has, unfortunately, been lost. Were it but forthcoming, it would set our minds at rest with regard to some of the perplexed questions respecting the attitude of the Patricius in the papal election.

Leo III. 796–816

[1] Eginhard : *sic flevit, ut filium aut si fratrem amisisset carissimum* (*Vita Karoli M.*, c. 19). The *Annal. Lauresham. ad Ann.* 795 say : *postquam a planctu cessavit — epitaffium aureis literis in marmore conscriptum jussit in Francia fieri, ut eum partibus Romae transmitteret ad sepulturam summi pontificis Adriani ornandam.*

The election had been free. The Acts concerning it, however, had been sent to the King, whose consent, at least in this form of official recognition, was prescribed as a patrician right. Leo accompanied the document by the gift of the keys of S. Peter's grave, to which he added, as an extraordinary symbol, the banner of the city.[1] At the same time, he summoned Charles to send one of his chief nobles to receive the oath of fidelity from the Roman people—a decisive proof that the Pope looked on the Frankish King as overlord of Rome.[2]

Angilbert sent to Rome.

Charles sent Angilbert, Abbot of S. Richar, as envoy to the Pope, entrusting the messenger with costly gifts to S. Peter, and enjoining him at the same time to confirm anew the relations, already stipulated by treaty, with Rome and the Church. In his own letter to Leo he says: "We have entrusted Angilbert with everything which appears desirable to us or necessary to you, in order that we may come to a mutual agreement as to what you esteem requisite for the advancement of the Holy Church of God, your honour, or the strengthening of our Patriciate. For as I contracted a treaty of sacred paternity with your predecessor, I desire also to

[1] *Annal. Laurissens. ad Ann.* 796: *Leo mox, ut in locum ejus successit, misit legatos cum muneribus ad regem, claves etiam confessionis S. Petri, et vexillum Romanae urbis eidem direxit.* Similarly, *Reginon. Chron.* (*ad Ann.* 796), which is a transcript of those annals; thus, too, *Annal. Einhardi*, and *Poeta Saxo*, who does them into verse; *Annal. Bertiniani; Tiliani ad Ann.* 796.

[2] *Rogavit ut aliquem de suis optimatibus Romam mitteret, qui populum Romanum ad suam fidem atque subjectionem per sacramenta firmaret. Annal. Einhardi.*

conclude the inviolable compact of the same faith and love with you, in order that I may obtain the apostolic blessing of your Holiness, and that, with God's will, the seat of the Roman Church may be defended through our devotion. And may it follow, with the help of the divine love, that the Holy Church of Christ may be guarded against heathens and unbelievers with weapons from without, and inwardly protected by the maintenance of the Catholic faith. It behoves you, therefore, oh most Holy Father! with hands uplifted, as Moses to God, to support our knighthood, that through your intercession, and under God's guidance, His Holy name may everywhere obtain the victory, and the name of our Lord be glorified throughout the world."[1]

It does not follow from this letter that Charles, as has stupidly been asserted, implored the Pope to ratify his title of Patricius. Through his envoys he congratulated Leo, and desired a fresh adjustment of the treaty (still by right existing), which had its legitimate expression in the Patriciate. If the letter explains the relations between the Pope and the Patricius, in general, from the side of their duties,

[1] *Ep. ad Leon. Papam apud Alcuin.*, ed. Froben., ii. pars. 2, App. 559: *illique omnia injunximus, quae vel nobis voluntaria, vel vobis necessaria esse videbantur, ut ex collatione mutua conferatis, quidquid ad exaltationem S. Dei Ecclesiae, vel ad stabilitatem honoris vestri, vel Patriciatus nostri firmitatem necessarium intelligeratis . . . vestrum est, s. Pater, elevatis ad Deum cum Moyse manibus nostram adjuvare militiam.* I have used the word knighthood, which, however, belongs to a later age, to express the idea of militia. It is to be observed that only the *honor* of the Pope is spoken of. During the later Middle Ages, however, *honor*, in the language of feudalism, denoted a positive right.

the limits of their rights are not defined, and all that the King had to say, with regard to the exercise of such rights over the city and the provinces bestowed upon S. Peter, had already been explained in his verbal instructions to his minister. He had received the keys of the grave and the banner of Rome, symbols by which, it is supposed, the Dominium was surrendered to his keeping; and it therefore becomes necessary to try and explain the meaning of these symbols. Chroniclers relate that in the year 800, before the East had any knowledge of Charles's coronation, monks had brought him the like symbols from Jerusalem. They asserted that two friars from the Mount of Olives and S. Saba, sent by the Patriarch of that sacred city, had accompanied the presbyter Zacharias (Charles's legate to Haroun al Raschid) on his return to Rome, and had brought "the keys of the Saviour's grave and of the place of Calvary, with the banner, in token of blessing" to the King.[1] The patriarch of a city under the rule of the Caliphs could scarcely have conceived the idea

The keys of the Apostle's grave.

[1] The *Annal. Laurissens. ad Ann.* 800 say, it is true: *qui benedictionis causa claves sepulcri dominici ac loci calvariae, claves etiam civitatis et montis cum vexillo detulerunt* (or, according to the *Chron. Moissiacense ad Ann.* 801, *et montis Sion cum vexillo crucis*). Einhard, however, their compiler and continuator, is silent concerning the keys of the city, and speaks only of those of the grave and of Mount Calvary. Matthew of Westminster (*Flores Historiar.—de reb. Britann. ad Ann.* 801) in the fourteenth century relates that the Patriarch of Jerusalem sent Charles a silver vexillum and the keys of the holy places (*claves locorum sanctissimorum dominicae resurrectionis*). Eginhard (*Vita Carol.*, c. 16) says of Haroun merely that he *Carolo sacrum illum et salutarem locum, ut illius potestati adscriberetur, concessit.*

of transferring the dominion over Jerusalem into the hands of the Frank. Haroun, however, himself invested the celebrated hero of the West with the guardianship of the holy places of Christendom, and, in consequence of the compact thus formed, the Patriarch sent the banner of the Church of Jerusalem and the keys of the holy places to Charles, not as gifts of blessing merely, but also as symbols of guardianship; thus putting these places under the protection of the Western monarch. The idea of a Patricius of Jerusalem had not been conceived, but Charles accepted the symbols as guardian protector of the sacred city.

These symbols serve to explain the keys of the grave of the Prince of Apostles and the Roman banner. Both denote the armed guardianship of the Defender of the Christian faith. But if Charles could be nothing more for the Church of Jerusalem than the Advocate *in partibus infidelium*, his position with regard to Rome was widely different. The golden keys were, in his hands, no mere miraculous gifts of honour, but signs of duties and rights in relation to the Roman Church and its possessions. As S. Peter and the Pope bore the keys in dogmatic matters, so in political affairs Charles was henceforth guardian of the keys and Defender of the Palladium of the Roman Church, of the Apostle's grave, and all that was comprehended by the shrine (and numerous deeds of gift were contained within it).[1] He was,

[1] I reject the opinion of Le Cointe (*Annal. Eccl. Francor. Ann.* 796, n. 11), who believes that these keys were the amulets customary in ancient times, and agree with Alemanni (*De Lateran. parietinis*,

therefore, represented as Standard-bearer of the Church.

Charles Standard-bearer of the Church.

The inscription on an altar slab in S. Peter's, of which we have already spoken, allows us to infer that Adrian had already sent the Vexillum to the Patricius Charles; and that the presentation of the symbol was not unprecedented, has been already shown by the case of the banner of Jerusalem. Even earlier than this, convents had presented banners to their defenders as symbols of armed advocacy, and from the tenth century onwards the custom of sending such banners had become more frequent.[1] The banner belonged to Charles in his capacity of Patricius or Dux of the Romans; the Vexillum in his hand announced that the "Militia" of Rome was entrusted to his care. Historians, therefore, fitly name this Vexillum "Banner of the Roman City," and thereby allow it to be understood that in this purely military symbol the voice of the Roman army and people was expressed; the two bodies thus

c. 14, p. 95), who says: *quibus templi Vaticani aptabantur fores, vel quibus Petri monumenti adyta et penetralia servabantur.* That this was the view held by contemporaries is clear from Theodulf of Orleans (*Dom. Bouquet*, v. 421), who says to King Charles:—

*Coeli habet hic* (sc. Petrus) *claves, proprias te jussit habere,*
*Tu regis Ecclesiae, nam regit ille poli,*
*Tu regis ejus opes, clerum, populumque gubernas.*

And *Poeta Saxo* in the ninth century (vers. 4, 5, *Ann.* 796):—

*Confestim claves, quibus est confessio sancti*
*Conservata Petri, vexillaque miserat urbis*
*Romuleae—*

The Frankish bishops already regarded Charles as head and ruler of the whole Church; the Pope as his subject.

[1] Pagi, *Critic. Ann.* 796, n. iv., and *Ann.* 740, n. xi.

uniting in transferring to Charles the office of military leader. Meanwhile, we hear neither of the army or the nobles taking any official part in investing Charles with these symbols, while the Senate remains shrouded in impenetrable darkness. The royal letters, brought by Angilbert, were addressed to the Pope alone. The city obeyed the Pope; its army stood at the service of the Apostle; its very banner was confided by the Pope to the Miles and Defensor of the Church; and in mosaics of the time S. Peter himself is represented as entrusting it to the hands of the King. Both secular and spiritual ideas were somewhat confused at this period; and as the word *respublica* has a twofold sense, so the Vexillum of the city becomes that not only of the Church and Christendom, but even of the Empire, like the Labarum of Constantine.[1] Charles was thus at the same time General of the Church (what in later times was called *Confalonerius Ecclesiae*), and also supreme judge in Rome.

Charles Overlord of Rome.

But the Patriciate was important, and accompanied by positive rights, and it was to discuss and settle these rights on the basis of a treaty that Angilbert was to meet the Pope. It was in virtue of Charles's office that the Pope required him to despatch one of his nobles to Rome to receive the oath of fidelity from the Roman people. The Pope hastened to confirm the supreme military and judicial authority of the protector, in the absence of whose supreme power to judge and to punish, the Papacy itself

[1] Pagi calls this banner *vexillum s. Petri* or *Ecclesiae*, and Alemanni says not only *vexillum urbis*, but also *patriciatus*.

remained defenceless. After the usurpation of Toto, the Popes recognised that they could remain rulers neither of the city nor of their patrimonies, unless an Imperial power, to which the Romans would yield obedience, were placed over temporal affairs. The Patricius now came more prominently forward. Besides the duty of defending the Church, he also made good his right of exercising supreme jurisdiction in the territory which had been bestowed upon it, and throughout the duchy which had been silently subjugated by it.[1] After the fall of the Lombard kingdom, to the crown of which that of the Franks was united, the title of Patricius, together with the consciousness of all its rights, was for the first time claimed by Charles. If he had never made use of this title in diplomas before 774, after this date, at least, he began to adopt it.[2] On the occasion of his first visit to Rome he was received with the honours which had previously been rendered to an Exarch. He himself yielded to Adrian's wish, and showed himself to the people, clad as a Roman Patricius, unwillingly renouncing his Frankish attire in favour

[1] De Marca, *De Concordia*, &c., i. c. xii. n. iv.: *Patricii nomen duo quaedam complectebantur, et jurisdictionem qua Reges in urbe ex consensu Pontificis et pop. Romani potiebantur, et protectionem seu defensionem quam Rom. Ecclesiae polliciti erant;* he is followed by Pagi, *Ann.* 740, n. viii. Le Cointe strives to maintain his opinion that Rome obeyed the Greek Emperor until the time of Leo III., and in Charles's Patriciate sees merely the *protectio* (*Annal. Eccl. Francor. Ann.* 754, n. 57; *Ann.* 796, n. 15). Alemanni recognises in the Patricius only the Defensor and *filius adoptivus* (*De Lateran. parietin.*, p. 64).

[2] Charles had previously signed himself *Carolus gratia Dei Rex Francorum, vir inluster*. Mabillon, *De re diplom.*, c. ii. 3, p. 73, and the "Diplomata Caroli Magni" in *Dom. Bouquet*, v.

of the vestments which, according to the significant remark of his biographer, he only twice wore. The first time at the request of Adrian, the second at that of Leo, he arrayed himself in the long tunic and chlamys and in the Roman shoes, which are described by Cassiodorus as being part of the dress of the Patricius. In this attire he is represented in an ancient picture, standing between his two chancellors.[1] The limits of the authority exercised by Charles as Patricius had already been determined by Adrian and himself as early as 774. Leo III. had simply to renew these relations by treaty, and Pope and King to confirm them by a mutual oath.[2] The Patriciate was an office which lasted for life and did not require fresh confirmation, but the King commissioned his envoy to express himself clearly with regard to an extension of his powers. He received from the new Pope recognition of his supreme jurisdiction in Rome, the Duchy, and the Exarchate; Angilbert, in his name, accepted the oath of fidelity from the Romans, and Leo acknowledged that Rome, and even he himself, had to yield obedience to Charles as overlord. The Pope, on his side, possessed territorial authority in the provinces subject to his rule. This authority, however, rested

[1] Eginhard, *Vita*, c. 23. *Romae semel, Adriano pontifice petente, et iterum Leone successore ejus supplicante, longa tunica et chlamide amictus, calceis quoque Romano more formatis utebatur.* Mabillon, *Supplem. de re diplom.*, c. ix. iii. 39, gives a portrait of Charles in the dress of the Patricius, taken from a Cod. of Paulus Petavius.

[2] This is also the view of de Marca, iii. c. xi. n. 8: *fides illa et subjectio populi Romani jure patriciatus debebatur Carolo; quam novis sacramentis adhibitis confirmari Leo cupiebat.*

essentially on the episcopal immunity, the exemption from the jurisdiction of the Dux, and consisted in a condition similar to that which, in the course of time, developed in most of the cities and bishoprics in Italy. We may, therefore, consider the Roman ecclesiastical state as a great, or the greatest, instance of episcopal immunity.[1]

The commanding position which Charles assumed in Rome and the West, the requirements of the Church, and the ideas of the time led at length to the restoration of the Western Empire. Out of the chaos following the overthrow of the Roman Empire, after a long process of evolution, two powers had arisen, which were thenceforth to rule the European world. In Rome the Papacy, resting upon Latin foundations, had developed as a spiritual power, concentrating within it the great system of the Church throughout all the provinces of the West. Amid the German provinces on the other side of the Alps, the Frankish monarchy had arisen, which already extended its dominion as far as Rome, and whose mighty head was about to unite the greater portion of the West in an Empire. One and the same necessity united the representatives of the two powers, the ecclesiastical and political, the necessity of strengthening one another and giving a permanent form to the newly-arisen system of the world. Gregory the Great had already announced that the

[1] The idea of a "State of the Church" is utterly incongruous with the spirit of the age. In Rome the Pope acquired the rights of the Dux (*Ducatus*), as other bishops acquired those of the Comes (*Comitatus*).

spiritual power of the Church had reached maturity, and, during the Iconoclastic controversy, his successors on the papal chair had established the claims by which it was rendered independent of the temporal power of the Empire. After it had won its freedom from the Byzantine Empire, the important question became how to exhibit to mankind the new alliance which the Church had formed with the newly-arisen political power in the German West. The exhibition of this union to the eyes of the world afforded full occupation to Leo III. Some mosaics, which he caused to be executed in the Roman churches after 796, gave expression to his ideas and to the requirements of the time. He had already caused his portrait to be depicted with that of Charles the Great in the Basilica of S. Susanna. Pope and King here stood at the two ends of a row of nine figures, each on a mountain-like peak. The Pope, a dignified figure with beardless face and tonsured head, held in his hands a model of the building; Charles, as Patricius, wore a Roman tunic, and above it a long mantle with richly-embroidered border, beneath which the sheath of his sword showed itself. A berretta, encircled by a crown, covered his head, his feet were encased in shoes with *tibialia* or ribbons wound Roman fashion round his legs up to the knees.[1]

The relations between the spiritual and temporal powers depicted in the mosaics of the time.

[1] The mosaics in the tribune of S. Susanna were destroyed about the year 1600. A copy, however, has been preserved. For the figures of Charles and Leo, see Alemanni, *De Lateran. Pariet.*, p. 7, and Ciampini, *Veter. Mon.*, ii. tab. xlii. While Alemanni only gives Charles mustachios, Ciampini represents him with a beard, and wear-

Thus, for the first time, a place in a Roman church, side by side with saints and apostles, was accorded to a king. It is true that, in the sixth century, the people of Ravenna had depicted the Emperor Justinian and his wife in the tribune of S. Vitale;[1] but in Rome neither Justinian, his predecessors, nor his successors had ever received a like honour. In another celebrated mosaic the harmonious government of the world, through its two heads, was expressed in a manner entirely distinct and personal.

In the Triclinium of the Lateran.

Between the years 796 and 799 Leo III. enlarged the Triclinium of the Lateran Palace by a magnificent building called the *Triclinium majus*. It was panelled with marble, ornamented with reliefs, supported on pillars of porphyry and white marble, and enclosed three tribunes with pictures in mosaic. Of these the mosaics in the principal tribune, preserved in a facsimile of later times, may still be seen at the Lateran.[2] In the middle is the Saviour, standing on

ing a fillet ending in a lily. Ugonio, who saw this mosaic, attributes it, although without any reason, to the year 800.

[1] See illustration in Ciampini, *Veter. Mon.*, ii. tab. xxii.

[2] *Lib. Pont.* in Leone III., n. 367. *Triclinium majus super omnia triclinia nomine suae magnitudinis decoratum.* A dining-hall, with eleven tribunes, built by Leo III. in the Lateran, is named by Alemanni, *triclinium minus*. This custodian of the Vatican, by whom the *Historia Arcana* of Procopius was brought to light and edited, devoted his work, *De Lateranensibus Parietinis restitutis* (Rome, 1625; with an appendix, Rome, 1756), to the earlier of these triclinia. The work was written at the instance of Cardinal Francesco Barberini, the nephew of Urban VIII., who restored Leo's tribunes. The facsimile of the mosaic stands in the open air in a niche of the chapel Sancta Sanctorum; Benedict XIV., about 1743, having caused an exact copy to be made by the aid of the drawings in the Vatican library, on the destruction of the tribune.

the pinnacle of a mountain, from which issue four streams. He holds a book, which bears on its open page the words *Pax vobis*. With right hand uplifted, He instructs the listening disciples, who, their mantles gathered over their arms, stand at each side, ready to go forth in obedience to their instructions, as shown in the words below. "Go and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and lo! I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." A second inscription on the arch bears the words: "Glory be to God in the Highest, and on the earth peace to men of good will."[1]

To the right and left of this picture are depicted two scenes representing the harmony of the two powers, and the divine investiture of their representatives. On one side is Pope Sylvester with Constantine the Great, on the other, Leo III. and Charles the Great. Recollections of Constantine, the first founder of the Imperial Church, to whom was attributed the great donation of Rome and Italy to the Pope, were rife at this period; the new relations which Sylvester's successor had formed by his alliance with the Frankish King affording of itself the parallel. The most powerful ruler of the West, the King of Italy and Patricius of the Romans, the conqueror of so many heathen tribes, had already been termed the new Constantine by the priests,

[1] *Euntes docete omnes gentes baptizantes eos in nomine Patris, et Filii et Spiritus sancti*, &c., and *Gloria in excelsis Deo, et in terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis*. In the middle of the tribune the name of Leo is entwined with the monogram of Christ.

and had surpassed the ancient Emperor in the extent of his actual and not merely imaginary donations. The mosaic was a work of the art of his age, and so clearly expressed the historic conditions of the time that, although rude in execution, yet, with respect to the idea represented, it constituted the greatest artistic achievement of a long course of centuries.

In the picture Christ sits enthroned at the right, at one side kneels Sylvester, at the other Constantine—contemporaries, and, according to legend, united by the ties of friendship. The Saviour hands the Pope the keys, the Emperor the Labarum, which Constantine grasps with his right hand. Beside him is written R. CONSTANTINUS.[1]

To this picture the other mosaic on the left entirely corresponds, except that in the latter Peter takes the place of Christ. The Apostle holds three keys upon his knees; with the right hand he bestows the stole on Leo as the symbol of papal dignity, with the left the banner on Charles in token of

[1] No inscription marks the figure of the Pope. I have adopted the explanation given by Alemanni, and rejected that of Muratori (*ad Ann.* 798), who holds the papal figure to represent Peter; that of Constantine, Constantine V. Still more indefensible is the view of Assemanni, that Adrian and Charles are here depicted (*Excerpta de sacr. Imag.*, Appendix in Alemanni). Alemanni argues that the chief figure represents Sylvester, and the parallelism makes this evident. Is it credible that at this period a Pope would accord a Byzantine Emperor a place in a mosaic in the Lateran? The square frame round the head of Constantine is to be explained by opposition to the glory round that of Sylvester, unless, with Alemanni, we assume it here and elsewhere to be an allegory of the four cardinal virtues. The *R.* over *Constantinus* is appropriately explained by Pagi as signifying *Rex*—a translation of the word *Basileus*, which signifies autocracy.

temporal supremacy. The King wears a berretta, encircled by a crown, as in the mosaic in S. Susanna, and in form and dress the two portraits closely resemble one another. Upon the square setting which surrounds the head of the Pope are inscribed the letters SC̄SSIMVS. D. N. LEO. P. P., on the other (the King's) D. N. CARVLO. REGI. Under the picture itself:—

BEATE. PETRE. DONA.
VITA. LEONI. PP. ET. BICTO
RIA. CARVLO. REGI. DONA.

In earlier mosaics the Popes had simply styled themselves "Bishops and servants of Christ," but towards the end of the eighth century, like the ancient Emperors, they began to adopt the title Dominus, a title which, however, they did not as yet engrave upon their coins.[1] The Romans were accustomed on solemn occasions to shout "Life to our Lord the Pope!" as in Byzantine times they had shouted "Life and victory to our Lord the Emperor!"

[1] A coin, wrongly attributed by Baronius to Leo I., bears the inscription, *D.N. Leoni Pape*, on the reverse the bust of Peter, with the keys hanging over his shoulder. The coin is doubtful, however, and is not accepted by Angelo Cinagli in *Le Monete de' Papi descritte*, &c., Fermo, 1848. Before the times of the Carolingians there was no papal coinage, the coins of Gregory III. and of Zacharias being merely Tesserae. The earliest papal silver denarii which have come down to us belong to Adrian I. Beside the bust of the Pope and the inscription, DN. HADRIANUS PAPA, they bear also the legend: VICTORIA DNN. CONOB. See Cinagli, whose work is more complete than those of Vignolius or Fioravanti; and finally, Promis, *Monete dei Romani Pontefici avanti il Mille*, Turin, 1858.

Although the Pope had become ruler in Rome, the title, "Our Lord," was also awarded to Charles. Even before his elevation to the Imperial throne, chroniclers and poets had celebrated his praises, saying that he had united the city of Romulus with the empire of his ancestors.[1]

These mosaics were executed in the triclinium, by order of the Pope, after the confirmation of the treaty through Angilbert. They were the monument of this treaty, and, according to Leo's biographer, the dining-hall was already in use in 799. If begun in 796, the mosaics may have been finished before the Christmas festival of 800, consequently before Charles's coronation as Emperor had taken place. The title *Rex* or King, it is true, was not incompatible with the Imperial dignity, but we may reasonably ask, if the picture were not executed until after the Imperial coronation, why, instead of *Rex*, the more appropriate title was not accorded him; the title with which, according to the definite statements of the time, the Frankish monarch was greeted:— *Carolo piissimo Augusto, a Deo coronato magno, pacifico*

[1] I here collect these important utterances: *Pauli* (*Diaconi*) *Gesta Episcop. Metens.* (*Mon. Germ.*, ii. 265): *Romanos praeterae, ipsamque urbem Romuleam, jam pridem ejus praesentiam desiderantem, quae aliquando mundi totius domina fuerat, et tunc a Langobardis depressa gemebat, duris angustiis eximens, suis addidit sceptris.* Paul's *Epitaph. Hildegardis reginae* (*ibid.*):—

*Cumque vir armipotens sceptris junxisset avitis*
*Cigniferumque Padum Romuleumque Tybrim.*

*Chron. Moissiac.* (*Mon. Germ.*, i. 305): *quia ipsam Romam matrem imperii tenebat;* and, copying it, the *Vita S. Willehadi* (ii. 381). *Annal. Laureshan. ad Ann.* 801: *ut ipsum Carolum—regem Francorum, imperatorem nominare debuissent, qui ipsam Romam tenebat.*

*Imperatori, Vita et Victoria!* Even at a later date the Byzantines, regarding the Western Emperors as usurpers, never bestowed the title *Imperator* upon them, but merely that of *Riga* or *Rex*. In this mosaic we consequently do not recognise the monument of the restoration of the Empire at the end of the year 800. The great event undoubtedly hovered in the air, and the mosaic in the Lateran a year beforehand pointed only perhaps to Charles's inevitable elevation to the throne of the Western Empire.[1]

### 2. Conspiracy of Adrian's Nephews and other Aristocrats against Leo III.—Attempt on the Life of the Pope—His Flight to Spoleto, Journey to Germany, and Meeting with Charles—Rome in the Power of the Nobility—Alcuin's Advice to Charles—Leo's Return to Rome, 799—Charles, through his Envoys, takes Proceedings against the Accused.

An unexpected occurrence was destined to be the immediate cause of the restoration of the Roman Imperium. The close alliance of Leo with Charles, the recognition of Charles's authority in the city, the

[1] Alemanni seeks to prove that the mosaics are later than the year 800, and the monument not only of Leo's restoration, but of the *Translatio imperii*. I agree with Pagi (*Ann.* 796, n. vi.), who says Charles was called Dominus as Patricius and Supreme Judge of Rome. De Marca (*De Concor.*, iii. c. xi.) terms the mosaic the monument of the Patriciate; he, however, asserts erroneously that the *consortium dominii* lasted until 800, and assumes a *consortium imperii*. Natal. Alexand., *Hist. Eccles.*, diss. 24, tom. iv., servilely adopts these views. Meanwhile, it is unnecessary to accept the idea of Dominus so literally.

urgency with which the Pope had summoned him to take possession of Rome, lead us to suppose that Leo dreaded some hostile movement among the people. In the course of the eighth century a clerical aristocratic government had developed in the city, since it was, above all, the Proceres or Judices de Clero who here possessed the greatest influence. The seven ministers of the palace conducted all business affairs, and for nearly a century the Primicerius of the notaries had, next to the Pope, been the most important man in Rome. His power, exemplified in the dangerous case of Christophorus and Sergius, had not been lessened by their fall; under Adrian, indeed, it had probably increased; and in Adrian we discover the first indication of Papal nepotism. His family, one of the most prominent amongst the nobility, through him became more powerful, and we find his nearest relations entrusted with the most important affairs and filling the highest offices of state. His uncle Theodatus called himself Consul and Dux, and was Primicerius of the Church. His nephews Theodore and Paschalis possessed immense influence in the city.[1] The latter he raised to the Primiceriate, and, since this office was not affected by any change in the Papacy, it was retained by Paschalis after the death of his uncle. The nephew of a Pope who had ruled

Adrian's nephews conspire against Leo III.

[1] Theodorus was Dux et Consul, and several times acted as Adrian's ambassador. *Cod. Carol.*, Cenni, pp. 353, 356, 359. *Theodorum eminentiss. nostrum nepotem* (thus begins the system of nepotism in Rome); p. 385: *Theodorum eminentiss. Consulem, et Ducem, nostrumque nepotem;* p. 358: *Paschalem nostrum nepotem.*

Rome with renown for twenty-three years, and had accustomed his relations to the highest dignities, beheld, with sullen rage, the government pass into the hands of an upstart of another family. His relations and clients, creatures of Adrian, and several optimates of the clergy and militia, listened to the promptings of his hatred. To the personal enmity cherished by Adrian's family (necessarily deprived by the new Pope of the influence they had hitherto possessed) was united the hostility of the Romans to papal supremacy. This resistance dated from the hour that gave birth to the temporal power of the Popes, and, continuing through a long series of revolutions, has not ended even now. The whole history of the human race affords no example of a struggle of such long duration, or one so unchanged in motive, as the struggle of the Romans and Italians against the *Dominium temporale* of the Popes, whose kingdom ought not to have been of this world.

In conjunction with the Saccellarius Campulus (apparently his brother), Paschalis formed the scheme of depriving the Pope of the government, and of seizing the authority by force.[1] The occasion of a procession was to furnish the desired opportunity, and the attempt was made amid scenes of tumult. The 25th of April, the festival of S. Mark, the day on which the great procession annually took place,

[1] That Adrian's nephews were the chief agents in the revolt, we are also informed by Theophanes, *Chronogr.*, p. 399: *οἱ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ συγγενεῖς τοῦ μακαρίου πάπα Ἀδριανοῦ συγκινήσαντες τὸν λαόν*, &c. Campulus was notary of the Church in 784; and Cenni believes him to have been the brother of Paschalis (*Cod. Carol.*, Ep. 78 *alias* 72, and note 5, p. 427).

Attempt on the life of Leo III.

was the date appointed. The procession advanced from the Lateran to S. Lorenzo in Lucina, where, in presence of the assembled people, the Collecta, or universal prayer, was recited. Thither the Pope was accustomed to proceed on horseback, accompanied by his court. As Leo left the Lateran, Paschalis approached to take his place in the procession, and rode, Campulus following him, before the Pope. Their confederates awaited them at the monastery of S. Sylvester in Capite, and here rushed with drawn swords on the cavalcade. The procession was put to rout, and the Pope, dragged from his horse, fell amid the swords of the enraged aristocrats. His papal vestments were torn from him ; with Byzantine cruelty, his assailants sought to deprive him of eyes and tongue. At length he was left lying by the door of the church ; Paschalis and Campulus dragged him inside the convent, threw him down before the altar, and ordered the Greek monks to shut him up in a cell.[1] In the night he was removed to S. Erasmus on the Coelian, and there kept in strict custody. Priests relate that, at S. Peter's entreaty, God immediately restored his eyes and tongue ; and the miracle proves that the ill-used

[1] *Vita Leonis*, n. 368 : *crudeliter oculos ei evellere, et ipsum penitus caecare conati sunt. Nam lingua ejus praecisa est. Annal. Laureshamenses. Ann.* 799. *Romani—absciderunt linguam ejus, et voluerunt eruere oculos ejus. Annal. Einhardi : erutis oculis, ut aliquibus visum est, lingua quoque amputata*, &c. Angilbert says with quaint elegance :—

*Carnifices geminas traxerunt fronte fenestras,*
*Et celerem abscindunt lacerato corpore linguam.*
—*Mon. Germ.*, ii. 400.

Pope had, fortunately, never been deprived of either.[1] Profound terror reigned in the city, where the bloody scenes of the days of the usurper Constantine seemed about to be renewed. The conspirators were numerous, and belonged to the highest rank. A baron of the Campagna, Maurus of Nepi, a compatriot of Toto, and a member perhaps of the same family, appears to have supported the rebel forces by a band of armed Tuscans.[2] But the outrage had either deprived the insurgents of their powers of reflection, or else they failed to receive from the populace the support on which they had reckoned for their ill-arranged schemes. They put forward no anti-Pope; a proof that the people had risen not against the Bishop, but against the Dominus of Rome. The entire city now found itself in the hands of the insurgents.

Meanwhile, Leo's wounds healed, and Paschalis was one day startled by the news of his escape. Albinus, his courageous chamberlain, and other faithful followers, had effected the Pope's deliverance, had lowered him from the wall of the

Flight of the Pope.

[1] Alcuin (Ep. xiii. ad Regem) contented himself with saying: *deus compescuit manus impias—volentes—lumen ejus extinguere.* Joh. Diaconus, *Chron. Episcop. S. Neap. Eccl.*, of the ninth century (Murat., i. 2, 312); *cum vellent oculos eruere—unus ei oculus paululum est laesus.* The Pope upheld the belief in a miracle, and presented a piece of tapestry to S. Peter's, *habentem historiam caeci illuminati, et resurrectionem* (*Vita Leon.*, n. 379).

[2] The *Lib. Pont.*, n. 370, speaks of Maurus Nepesinus as one of the leaders of the party beside Paschalis and Campulus. The *Annales Einhardi ad Ann.* 801 say: *hujus factionis fuere principes Paschalis nomenclator et Campulus saccellarius, et multi alii Romanae urbis habitatores nobiles.* So, too, *Annal. Bertinian.*

monastery by a rope, and brought him unharmed to S. Peter's. Part of the clergy and people rallying round the fugitive, the conspirators dared not attempt to drag him away from the tomb of the Apostle; they sacked the houses of Leo and Albinus, but could not prevent the further flight of the Pope. On receiving the news of these events, Winichis, Dux of Spoleto, at the head of a military force and accompanied by Wirundus, the Frankish envoy and Abbot of Stablo, had hastened to Rome; he took Leo in S. Peter's and conducted him safely to Spoleto.

The news of the Pope's fate spread rapidly abroad, and emissaries of Winichis intimated to Charles that Leo desired to come to him in person. The King was on the point of making war upon the Saxons when the news of Leo's immediate approach reached him. He crossed the Rhine at Lippeham, set up his camp at Paderborn, and, having sent Hildebald, Archbishop of Cologne, Count Ansarich, and King Pipin to meet the Pope, awaited there the arrival of the fugitive.[1] Leo, accompanied by some of his Roman clergy, and under the conduct of his illustrious escort, proceeded to Paderborn. When, forty years before, his predecessor Stephen had journeyed to meet Pipin, he had gone as a spiritual bishop possessing neither territory nor territorial power; but the Pope who fled to Pipin's son in 799 was ruler not only of Rome but of several cities and provinces. He came wounded and banished by the very Romans

[1] *Jahrb. des Fränk. Reichs unter Karl d. Groszen*, vol. ii. (by B. Simson, 1883), p. 172 f.

who "belonged to him," and Charles was now enabled to perceive the consequences entailed by the alliance of the temporal dominion with the spiritual priesthood.

The meeting of the two men at Paderborn formed an event in the history of the world. A poet and eye-witness, borrowing some colours from the then existing school — Virgil — to depict the scene, has left an interesting picture of the event. The poet was apparently the same Angilbert who had undertaken the embassy to Leo in 796. After having described Aachen, "the second Rome," and glorified the royal court in his poem on Charles the Great, his muse soars in a vision, according to the style of antiquity. "A sad portent and a dreadful monster," namely, the Pope, deprived of eyes and tongue, appears before the King in a dream, and Charles immediately sends three messengers to Rome to inform himself of Leo's fate.[1] The poet describes with rapid touches the circumstances existing there, Leo's journey, and his arrival at Paderborn. The Pope came, escorted by King Pipin, who had gone to meet him with ten thousand men; Charles, however, remained in his camp to await the arrival of his guest. At sight of Leo, the army sank three times on its knees to receive the

He meets Charles at Paderborn, 799.

[1] The envoys beheld Rome from Monte Mario :—

*Culmina jam cernunt Urbis procul ardua, Romae*
*Optatique vident legati a monte theatrum.*

The fragment of the poem, ascribed, certainly on insufficient grounds, to Angilbert (*Mon. Germ.*, ii. 393), is one of the best poems of Caroline times. Ebert, *Allgem. Gesch. der Liter. des Mittelalters im Abendlande*, ii. 58 f.

papal benediction, and, deeply moved, the greatest monarch of the West folded the ill-used fugitive in his arms. Warriors and paladins who had overcome the Saracens of Spain, the Avars of the Ister, the Saxons of Germany on many a bloody field, saluted the two heads of Christendom with shouts that rent the air.[1] The hymns of priests mingled with the clash of arms. Charles accompanied the Pope to the cathedral, and the solemn mass was followed by a banquet, where, according to the expression of Virgil's imitator, the goblets of ancient Bacchus foamed with the sweet Falernian wine.[2]

Rome in the power of the nobility.

While Leo lingered with Charles, enjoying these honours and discussing matters of weightiest import, Rome remained in the power of the faction which had driven him forth. Our knowledge, however, of the state of the city is more than obscure. Leo's biographer bestows but a hasty glance upon it,

[1] *Exoritur clamor, vox ardua pulsat Olympum.*

[2] *Aurea namque tument per mensas vasa falerno.*
*Rex Carolus simul et summus Leo praesul in orbe*
*Vescitur, atque bibunt pateris spumantia vina.*
*Post laetas epulas et dulcia pocula Bacchi*
*Multa pius magno Carolus dat dona Leoni.*

The medley of Christian and Pagan ideas repeats itself in all ages. Alcuin writes (Ep. ix.): *mitis ab aetherio clementer Christus olympo.* As in the days of Arator, God is frequently called Tonans by Angilbert and Theodulf. The poets of Charles's time called themselves Mopsus, Damoetas, Candidus, Flaccus, Corydon, Homerus, as if they belonged to the Roman Arcadia. Charles himself bore the name of David. No greater contrast can be found than exists between the Charles of the books of romance and the Charles of history, to whom is due this, the first renaissance of Paganism.

merely informing us that the usurpers sacked and laid waste the property belonging to S. Peter. The followers of Paschalis, more especially people from the country, who had come to Rome, indulged in many acts of violence, and assuredly did not spare their criticisms of the immense property which had fallen to the Church. They drew up a deed of accusation, the loss of which is the more to be regretted, in that it revealed the motives that instigated the rising against Leo III., and contained among other charges those of adultery and perjury. This justification they sent to the Patricius of Rome.[1] The proceedings of the rebels are worthy of note. The same Romans who had ill-treated and expelled the Pope calmly awaited Charles's sentence. They made no preparations for an armed defence, nor any opposition to Leo's return, nor did they seek by flight to escape their trial. A letter of Alcuin to the King shows the importance attached to this revolt. Charles, who had been on the point of setting forth on an expedition against the Saxons, had informed Alcuin of the occurrences in Rome, and had requested his counsel, and Alcuin replied. "There had hitherto been," he said, "three people supreme in the universe: the Vicar of S. Peter, who has now been so impiously treated, the Emperor and ruler of the second Rome, who no less barbarously has been hurled from his throne, and lastly, the

[1] *Falsa adversus sanctissimum Pontificem imponere crimina et post eum ad praedictum mittere Regem. Vita Leon. III.*, n. 372. Alcuin burnt a letter *querimonias quasdam habentem de moribus apostolici: Alcuini Ep.*, ed. Jaffé, 127.

King; and in the kingly office conferred by Christ, Charles has been appointed ruler of the Christian nations. In him alone, who surpasses the other two dignities in power, and (as he adds with independent judgment) also in wisdom, resides the welfare of Christianity." He goes on to say: "In no wise is the salvation of the head (Rome) to be neglected. It were more endurable that the feet (Saxons) should ache than that the head should suffer. Let peace be made, if it be possible, with the base people. Let threats be put aside a little, that the obdurate do not escape, but let them be maintained in hope, until salutary counsels recall them to peace. That which we would possess (Rome) must be upheld, in order that we lose not the greater to acquire the less. Our own hearth must be guarded, that the ravenous wolf may not lay it waste. Thus we must act in foreign matters, in order that we may not suffer loss in our own."[1]

Charles determined to exercise his supreme authority with impartial severity; not, as Leo probably may have hoped, in conducting the fugitive without further ceremony back to the Lateran by

[1] *Alcuin. Op. Ep. xi., ad domnum Regem: Componatur pax cum populo nefando, si fieri potest. Relinquantur aliquantulum minae, ne obdurati fugiant: sed in spe retineantur, donec salubri consilio ad pacem revocentur. Tenendum est quod habetur, ne propter adquisitionem minoris, quod majus est amittatur. Servetur ovile proprium, ne lupus rapax devastet illud. Ita in alienis sudetur, ut in propriis damnum non patiatur.* The *propria* are, undoubtedly, Charles's rights over Rome, and the *aliena* the affairs of Saxony, namely, the foreign territory of the hitherto unsubjugated Saxons. This has been shown by Döllinger, "Das Kaisertum Carl's der Groszen und seiner Nachfolger" (*Münchner Histor. Jahrbuch für* 1865).

force of arms; but in summoning him and his opponents before his tribunal. The complaints of the nobles against Leo must have been serious, and more probably referred to his temporal position and his government in Rome, rather than to any personal offences. Had it been otherwise, and had Adrian's nephews with their followers been simply regarded as murderers, they would never have subjected themselves to the judgment of the Patricius. We may assume that the insurgents were convinced of the justice of their cause, and that they rested it on the ancient majesty and freedom of the Roman people.

Leo returns to Rome, Nov. 29, 799.

We may suppose that Charles signified to the Romans his intention of sending his envoys to pronounce sentence according to regular procedure, since Leo left Germany in the autumn and returned to the city with a numerous retinue. He was accompanied by ten legates of Charles, who came to institute proceedings; by Hildebald, Archbishop of Cologne, Arno of Salzburg, the Bishops Cunibert, Bernhard, Hatto, Flaccus, and Jesse, and Counts Helmgot, Rotgar, and Germar. He was accorded an honourable reception in all the provinces and towns through which he passed: and the greeting which awaited him in Rome showed that, protected by his escort, he had no cause for fear. On approaching the city on Nov. 29th, he found all classes of the people assembled to greet him at the Milvian Bridge. The clergy, nobles, militia, the municipal guilds, the scholae of the foreigners, ranged under their respective banners, awaited his approach. Ac-

companying his progress with song, they conducted him to the Basilica of S. Peter, where he read mass and administered the Communion.[1]

The trial opened by the Frankish envoys.

He passed the night in one of the episcopal palaces beside S. Peter's, and it was not until the following day that he entered the Lateran. A short time after, Charles's envoys assembled for the trial in the Triclinium built by Leo. Paschalis, Campulus, and their companions took their places before the Frankish legates; and the most important trial which Rome had witnessed for centuries occupied the judges for several weeks. The acts of the trial, the slightest fragment of which, were it but the proceedings against the usurper Constantine, would have been of priceless historic value, have not come down to us; they would in all probability have proved the assertions of Leo's biographer, that the aristocrats had no grievances against the Pope, to be altogether unfounded. Although Adrian's nephews were unable to establish their accusations against Leo as priest, they bore at least strong witness against his temporal relations towards the city. The recent sovereignty of the Pope, even under Paul I., had excited the violent opposition of the Roman nobility, and been the cause of Constantine's usurpation. We have no definite information as to how the tribunal was composed, nor do we know whether to the ten Frankish envoys were added as magistrates any members of the Roman nobility. Never-

[1] *Vita Leonis*, n. 372: *tam Proceres clericorum cum omnibus clericis, quamque Optimates et Senatus, cunctaque Militia, et universus Populus Romanus—connexi ad pontem Milvium—susceperunt.*

theless, as the trial concerned the Pope and the Romans, we may assume this to have been the case.[1] The accused were apparently pronounced guilty, but sentence was referred to the decision of Charles.

3. CHARLES'S JOURNEY TO ROME—PARLIAMENT IN S. PETER'S—CHARLES'S SENTENCE ON THE ROMANS AND THE POPE—LEO'S OATH OF PURGATION—CHARLES ELECTED EMPEROR BY THE ROMANS—RESTORATION OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE—CHARLES THE GREAT CROWNED EMPEROR BY THE POPE, 800—OPINIONS CONCERNING THE LEGAL ORIGIN AND THE CONCEPTION OF THE NEW IMPERIUM.

Charles had promised the Pope himself to come to Rome to celebrate the Christmas festival of the year 800. He went in August to Mainz; after explaining to his nobles the duties which called him to Italy and Rome, he announced his approaching departure. Before leaving France he invited Alcuin to accompany him, but illness or love of his monastery (that of S. Martin of Tours) detained the worthy man, and the King playfully reproached him with preferring the smoke-blackened huts of Tours to Rome's glittering palaces.[2] The Abbot of S.

[1] In the trial for treason of Potho, Abbot of S. Vincentius on the Vulturnus, the tribunal was formed of the Frankish envoy and Archbishop Possessor, four abbots, Hildebrand Dux of Spoleto, the Dux Theodore, Adrian's nephew, and the papal officials of the Palace, the Librarian, Saccellarius and the notary Campulus, the same who himself now stood at the bar. *Cod. Carol.*, Ep. lxxii., in Cenni, lxxviii.

[2] *Me fumo sordentia Turonorum tecta auratis Romanorum arcibus praeponere*, &c. Alcuin., Ep. xiii.

Martin, however sent his muse to accompany his King, and the muse, inspired with visions of the future, announced that Rome, the capital of the world, the fount of the highest honours, the treasure-chamber of the saints, awaited Charles as ruler of the Empire and as Patron, and foretold that he was called thither to set up his tribunal, to establish peace, to restore the Pope by his judicial sentence, and lastly, under God's will, to rule the universe.[1]

Charles's expedition to Rome.

Charles advanced with his army to Ravenna, there remained seven days, proceeded to Ancona, and, having despatched Pipin with a part of his troops against Grimoald, the recalcitrant Duke of Benevento, continued on his way.[2] The approach of the most powerful man of the time, behind whose shield Rome and the Church stood protected, roused the city to the highest pitch of excitement, and while to some he appeared in the light of a dreaded avenger,

[1] These important verses, which announce the Imperator, are found in CCLXXI. Oper. Alcuini, Paris, 1617, and in Dümmler, *Poet. Latinor. medii aevi*, i. 1, p. 258.

*Roma caput mundi, primi quoque culmen honoris,*
*In qua gazarum munera sancta latent.*
*Quae modo dirupto plangit sua viscera foetu*
*Per te sanabit saucia membra cito. . . .*
*Talia compescat tua, rex, veneranda potestas,*
*Rectorem regni te Deus instituit . . .*
*Ipsa caput mundi spectat te Roma patronum*
*Cum patre et populo pacis amore pio. . . .*
*Rector et Ecclesiae per te, rex, rite regatur,*
*Et te magnipotens dextra regat Domini.*
*Ut felix vivas lato regnator in orbe,*
*Proficiens facias cuncta Deo placita.*

[2] B. Simson, *Jahrb. d. Fränk. Reichs unter Karl a. Gr.*, ii. 220.

and to others in that of a saviour, all expected unusual events.

Ancient Nomentum, as early as the fourth century the seat of a bishop, still existed on the Nomentan Way at the fourteenth milestone from the city. Here Leo, with the clergy, militia, and populace, waited to accord a solemn reception to the King. It was the 23rd November.[1] Charles halted and dined with the Pope, and after Leo, in an introductory conversation, had assured himself as to the prospect of events in Rome, he returned to the city, to receive his judge the following day. The King passed the night in Nomentum, and on the 24th advanced to the city. Instead of entering by the Nomentan Gate, he made a circuit of the walls and crossed the Milvian Bridge, in order first to reach S. Peter's. The Pope awaited him on the steps of the Basilica, and led him into the cathedral.

Sets up his tribunal in S. Peter's.

Charles summoned a meeting of clergy, nobles, and citizens, Romans and Franks. This parliament, a synod in the form of a tribunal, assembled in S.

[1] *Annal. Lauriss. ad A.* 800 : *occurrit ei pridie Leo papa et Romani cum eo apud Nomentum duodecimo ab urbe lapide.* The ancient Latin town still bore the name by which it was known to Virgil, vi. 773. It was later called Castrum Nomentanae, afterwards corrupted into Lamentana or Mentana. The place became celebrated through the family of the Crescentii, the champions of Roman freedom against the Papacy and Empire. After a long interval of obscurity, it again became historic through the battle fought there between Garibaldi and the papal and French troops on the 3rd Nov. 1867—a continuation of the ancient struggle against the temporal power of the Popes founded by Charles the Great. I wrote this in Rome, three days after the battle of Mentana. How strange are the links that unite dates so far asunder as the 23rd November 800 and the 3rd November 1867 !

Peter's on the 1st December. The King, clad in the toga and chlamys of the Patricius, took his seat beside the Pope. Archbishops, bishops and abbots were ranged around, while the inferior clergy and the united Roman and Frankish nobles remained standing.[1] Charles, addressing the assembly, announced that he had come to Rome to restore the disturbed discipline of the Church, to punish the outrage committed on its Head, and to pronounce judgment between the Romans the accusers, and the Pope the accused. Before the tribunal of the Patricius would be heard the complaints which the rebellious Romans had to bring against the Pope, and sentence of guilty or not guilty would be pronounced. Charles's judicial authority was undisputed. In him the Frankish bishops recognised the universal head of the Church; and the Pope, who had submitted himself to the enquiry of his plenipotentiaries, was, like every other Roman, his subject, and as such appeared before the tribunal of his judges. There can be no doubt that Leo subjected himself to this tribunal. The Frankish chroniclers assert the fact in plain terms; the *Liber Pontificalis*, however, conceals the proceedings of the enquiry, and asserts that the bishops unanimously rose and declared: "We should never presume to judge the apostolic chair, which is the Head of all the Churches of God; since we ourselves are judged by it and by His Vicar; over it there is no judge. Our conduct is in accordance with the custom of ancient times. In conformity with the canon we submit to that which the chief priest considers right." The same authority

[1] *Vita Leonis*, n. 374.

further goes on to say that the Pope replied: "I follow the example of my predecessors in the pontificate, and am ready to purge myself from the false accusations which malice has brought against me."[1]

Leo might have appealed, among other examples, to the case of Pelagius. Accused by some of the Romans of complicity in the death of Vigilius his predecessor, Pelagius had publicly exculpated himself by an oath in S. Peter's; and the ceremony had taken place under the eyes of Narses, who, as Patricius, represented at the time the majesty of the Emperor. Leo followed the example of his predecessor, although not until after the observance of judicial procedure had been fulfilled, that is to say, until Charles had accorded a second hearing to his accusers. The plaintiffs brought forward their charges; they were, however, unable to substantiate them, and Charles gave his verdict in favour of the bishops, who, declining to pronounce sentence, left it to the Pope to take the oath of purgation.[2] The ceremony took place a few days after the opening of

[1] *Qui universi dixerunt: nos sedem Ap., quae est caput omn. dei Ecclesiar., judicare non audemus. Nam ab ipsa nos omnes, et vicario suo judicamur, ipsa autem a nemine judicatur, quemadmod. et antiquitus mos fuit. Sed sicut ipse summus pont. censuerit, canonice obediemus. Venerab. vero praesul inquit: praedecessorum meor. pontif. vestigia sequor. Vita Leonis*, n. 374.

[2] *Annal. Lauresham. ad Ann.* 800 (or *Lambeciani* in Muratori, ii. 2): *et venerunt in praesentia qui ipsum apostolicum condemnare voluerunt, et cum cognovisset rex, quia non propter justitiam, sed per invidiam eum condemnare volebant*, &c. Leo's biographer is purposely silent: the *Annal. Lauriss.* and *Einhardi* say: *postquam nullus probator criminum esse voluit* (better read—*potuit*)—*se criminibus purgavit.*

The Pope takes the oath of purgation.

the parliament.[1] In presence of the King, the bishops and optimates of the city assembled in S. Peter's, and in sight of the populace, who, in closely serried masses, filled the nave of the Church, the Pope mounted the steps of the same chancel that Pelagius had formerly ascended, and, the gospels in his hand, pronounced the formula as follows:—

"It is known, beloved brethren, that evil-doers have risen up and have injured me and my life with their grievous accusations. Charles, the most gracious and illustrious King, has come to the city with priests and nobles to judge these men. Therefore I, Leo, Pontifex of the Holy Roman Church, judged by no man, nor forced by any, but of my own free will, purge myself in your presence, before God, who knows the conscience, before His angels, and before S. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, in whose sight we stand. I maintain that I have neither committed the sins whereof I am accused, nor have ordered them to be committed, and I call God, before whose tribunal we shall one day appear, and before whose eyes we here stand, as witness of my innocence. This I do, not compelled by any law, nor because I desire to impose any custom or decree on my successors or my brother bishops, but in order the more surely to free your minds from unjust suspicion."[2]

[1] According to Mühlbacher, not until the 23rd December.

[2] For this universal formula, taken from the *Ordo Romanus*, see Rasponius, *de Basilica et Patriarch. Lateran.*, lib. iv.; Appendix to Alexmanni, p. 120; Sigonius, Baronius, Labbé, &c. The account of the act itself is given in the *Vita Leonis*, n. 375; the *Annal. Lauriss.* and *Einhardi*, *ad Ann.* 800. The *Annal. Lauriss. minor.*, however, place the date of Leo's purification on the third day before

After Leo had confirmed this assurance by an oath, and the clergy had sung the Te Deum, the accused Pope again sat spotless on the apostolic chair, and his opponents, or the nobles who had previously been condemned to death, Paschalis, Campulus and their confederates, were surrendered to the executioner. The Pope, however, decided to pardon them, justly fearing that the execution of Adrian's relatives, and men so respected, would increase the hatred of the Romans. On his intercession, Charles banished them to France, where prisoners under sentence of exile were now sent, instead of to Byzantium as in former days.[1]

Condemnation of the guilty.

These proceedings were closed by one of the most eventful acts in the records of history; that of placing the crown of the Roman Emperors on the head of the Frankish King. Three hundred and twenty-four years had rolled away since representatives of the Roman Senate had appeared before Zeno, to lay the insignia of Empire in his hands, and explain that Rome and the West no longer had need of an Emperor of their own. During this long

The Imperium established in Rome.

Christmas, and Döllinger, Jaffé, and Simson believe this date to be correct.

[1] The *Vita Leonis*, n. 374, merely says: *tunc illos comprehendentes praedicti missi magni Regis, emiserunt in Franciam.* The *Annal. Lauriss.* and *Einhardi* represent the trial as taking place after the date of Charles's coronation, and say: *ut majestatis, rei, capitis damnati sunt—exilio deportati sunt.* The sentence was passed at the end of 799. The condemned appealed, and, after the Pope's oath of purgation, were sentenced to exile. The little work, *de imperatoria Potestate in urbe Roma* (*Mon. Germ.*, v. 719), it is true, relates other things of Charles: *uno die in Campo Latteranensi fecit trecentos decollari;* no chronicler, however, repeats this fable.

period of changing fortune and ever-increasing decay the Byzantine Emperors had continued to govern Italy as a province. The religious sentiment of mankind clung firmly to the idea of the Roman Empire, and, even as late as the end of the eighth century, emancipated Italy and the West revered its shadow in the title of the Byzantine Emperor. The institutions of antiquity, on which the throne of the Caesars had rested, had vanished, the idea of the Empire, however, still survived. It was the consecrated form in which the unity of the republic of mankind and the visible Church had, for centuries, found its representation. The Germans, who had destroyed the Western Empire, after having been received into Roman civilisation and the bosom of the Church, now effected its restoration. And the Church, whose laws controlled the West, from within herself created anew the Roman Empire, as the political form of her cosmopolitan principle, and that spiritual unity within which the Pope had embraced so many nations. His supremacy over all churches of the West could, moreover, only attain complete recognition through the Emperor and the Empire. The restoration of the Empire was rendered necessary by the formidable power of Islam, which not only harassed Byzantium, but, from the side of Sicily and Spain, also threatened Rome. The Greek Emperors could rule the West together with the East so long as the Roman Church was weak, so long as Italy lay sunk in lethargy, and the German West swarmed with lawless barbarians. It was no longer possible to do so when the Church attained independence,

Italy consciousness of her nationality, and Europe had become united in the powerful Frankisk Empire, at the head of which stood a great monarch. Thus the idea of proclaiming Charles Emperor arose, and thus was carried out the scheme with which the irate Italians had threatened Leo the Isaurian at the beginning of the Iconoclastic controversy. The West now demanded the occupation of the Imperial throne. True, in the course of time, the Byzantine Empire had acquired a legal sanction. Byzantium, however, was but the daughter of Rome. From Rome the Imperium had proceeded; here the Caesars had had their seat. The illustrious mother of the Empire now only resumed her rights when, as in ancient times, she offered the Imperial crown to the most powerful ruler of the West. Contemporary chroniclers, looking at the state of the world at the time, found that the Imperial power, which, since the days of Constantine, had had its seat, first in part and then exclusively, with the Greeks in Constantinople, was no longer to be held by one man alone. Two years before the outrage on the Pope, the dignity of the Emperor had also been violated in the person of Constantine VI. The Roman Republic was tyrannised over by Irene, an infamous woman, who had put out the eyes of her own son; and this being the case, the Imperial throne was considered vacant.[1] The crown of Constantine was therefore transferred to the Frankish

[1] *Quia jam tunc cessebat a parte Graecorum nomen imperatoris, et femineum imperium apud se habebant, tunc visum est et ipso apostolico Leoni . . . Annal. Lauresham. ad A.* 801.

monarch, already in possession of Rome, the capital of the realm, and of many other seats of the ancient empire. A transaction so momentous, and rendered necessary by the ideas of the time and the demands of the West, but which, nevertheless, bore the semblance of a revolt against the rights of Byzantium, could scarcely have been the work of the moment, but more probably was the result of a sequence of historic causes and resolutions consequent upon them. Can we doubt that the Imperial crown had long been the goal of Charles's ambition and the ideal of such of his friends as cherished Roman aspirations? He himself came to Rome evidently to take the crown, or, at least, to form some decisive resolution with regard to it, and during his sojourn in France the Pope had declared himself ready to help in the accomplishment of this great revolution.[1] The Popes had but hesitatingly renounced allegiance to the legitimate Imperial authority of Byzantium, an authority which they still continued to recognise even when the Frankish princes had risen to power in Italy. Necessity had forced them to throw themselves into the arms of France, and to bestow the dignity of Patricius on the Frankish princes; the Popes, in return, had received as a reward the State of the Church, and this State could only be protected by Frankish intervention. The expulsion of the Pope from Rome, whose Dominus he had

[1] This is expressly told us by Joh. Diaconus, *Vita S. Athanasii* (Murat., i. 2., p. 312): *Hic autem fugiens ad Carolum Regem, spopondit ei, si de suis illum defenderet inimicis, Augustali eum diademate coronaret.*

become, at length decided the question. Leo III., consequently, found himself obliged to allow the possession of the Imperial power to pass into the hands of a Western dynasty, that of the staunchly Catholic line of Pipin, a line which had received consecration at the hands of his predecessor Stephen. The zeal for the faith displayed by Pipin and his successor promised protection for the Latin Church, and the Frankish power the defence of Christendom against heathens and barbarians, while from Byzantium nothing could be expected but dogmatic heresies and the continuation of the despotic rule of Justinian. These parallel considerations had long since been weighed against one another.

We may suppose that Charles's clerical friends were the most zealous supporters of the scheme, which perhaps was not received by the Pope with a like degree of enthusiasm. Alcuin's letter proves that he, at least, had already been initiated into the idea;[1] and the Frankish envoys, after a year spent in Rome, had doubtless come to an understanding with the Romans, on whose vote the election mainly depended. The Romans it was who, exercising the ancient suffrages of the Senate and

[1] Besides the letter already quoted, see also Ep. 103, p. 153, where Alcuin accompanies his Christmas gift of a Codex of the Bible to Charles with the words: *ad splendorem Imperialis potentiae.* Fr. Lorentz, *Alcuin's Leben*, p. 235 *sq.* I lay more stress on the presence of Charles's son than on the consecrated gift. According to two diplomas, of the years 780 and 781 respectively, the title Imperator had been given to Charles before he had any claim to it. The validity of these documents is doubted, however, by Muratori. *Diplomatica Pontif.* of Marino Marini, p. 50.

people, had elected Charles their Patricius, and who now, in virtue of the same rights, elected him Emperor. And only as Emperor of the Romans and of Rome did he become Emperor of the entire State.[1] A decree of the Roman nobility and people had undoubtedly preceded the coronation; and Charles's nomination as Roman Emperor (in strict accordance with the plan of a papal election) was effected by the three traditional elective bodies.

Charles elected Emperor by the Romans.

The great revolution which extinguished the ancient rights of the Byzantines was not to appear the arbitrary deed of either King or Pope, but the act of God Himself, and therefore the legal transaction of Christendom, as expressed by the voice of the Roman people, of the parliament of the united clergy, optimates, and citizens assembled in Rome, Germans as well as Latins. The Frankish chroniclers themselves say that Charles was made Emperor by the election of the Roman people, quote the united parliament of the two nations, and enumerate the list of the members who took part in the parliament; the Pope, the entire assembly of bishops, clergy, and

[1] This is expressly asserted by the Emperor Lewis in his letter to the Emperor Basil in 871: *Nisi Romanorum Imperator essemus, utique nec Francorum. A Romanis enim hoc nomen et dignitatem assumsimus. Anon. Salernit.*, c. 102. The Romans always maintained that Charles had received the crown from the Senate and people. In the eleventh century the chronicler of Farfa wrote: *Carolum coronavit—et una cum omni senatu Romano imperium illi per omnia confirmavit* (Mur., ii. 2, p. 641). In the year 1328 the Parliament of the Romans proclaimed: *suas esse partes Imperium conferre, Pontificis autem consecrare, iisdem auspiciis: Carolum enim magnum tunc demum coronatum esse, postquam Populus Romanus eum imperare jussisset.* (Nicol., *Burgundus ad A.* 1328.)

abbots, the Frankish senate, the Roman optimates, and the rest of the Christian people.[1]

Was the coronation unexpected?

The resolution of the Romans and Franks was announced to Charles in the form of a request. Are we to believe that, like Augustus in former days, he made a feint of reluctance to accept the supreme dignity, until it was forced upon him as an accomplished fact? Are we to receive as hypocritical the assurance of a man so pious and heroic, when he asserts that the Imperial crown came upon him wholly as a surprise, and adds that he would not have entered S. Peter's had he known of Leo's intention?[2] Had not Charles's son, Pipin, been purposely recalled from the war against Benevento, in order to witness the Imperial coronation? An explanation of these conflicting statements has been sought in the statement of Eginhard, who maintains that Charles's hesitation was dictated by respect for Byzantium; that he had not yet assented to the scheme, and had sought by negotiations to gain the recognition of the Greeks to the election; that, therefore, the coronation really did take him by surprise, and, with regard to the time chosen, seemed inopportune.[3] This view is supported by some show

[1] *Vita Villehadi* (*Mon. Germ.*, ii. 381): *per electionem Romani populi*, and *electio* is not *acclamatio*. *Chron. Moissiacense* (*ibid.*, i. 305). *Omnes majores natu Romanor.* here appears to denote all Romans who were capable of voting. The *Lib. Pontif.* says briefly: *ab omnib. constitutus est imperator Romanorum.*

[2] Eginhard, c. 28, and the *invitus Papa cogente* of the poet Saxo.

[3] Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, iii. 175, and Döllinger in the treatise already quoted on the Empire of Charles the Great.

of probability, which, however, solely concerns the occasion chosen for the coronation, since to his elevation to the Imperial throne Charles had already long given his consent. The ceremony had been fixed to take place on the occasion of his visit to Rome, and his friends looked forward with certainty to the event.

In order to put an end to all further hesitation the act itself was performed without preparation and without pomp. Such was indeed the object of the Pope, who, anxious to appear the leading figure in the transaction, intended, by means of the coronation and consecration, to acquire for the Church a position of supreme authority. For it was he, her Supreme Head, who now actually made Emperor the man elected by the Romans and Franks. Nothing could have been more simple, nothing more unimposing, than this act of world historic importance. As Charles, having knelt before the shrine of S. Peter's on Christmas Day, rose from his knees, Leo, moved as it were by divine inspiration, placed a golden crown on his head, and, at the same moment, the assembled multitude, who awaited the signal and therefore understood the significance of the act, made the church resound with the shout which had formerly hailed the elevation of a Caesar: "Life and victory to Charles the most pious Augustus, crowned by God, great and peace-giving Emperor of the Romans."[1]

The act of coronation.

[1] *Carolo piissimo Augusto, a Deo coronato, magno, pacifico Imperatori, Vita et Victoria. Lib. Pont.* and the chroniclers, *Annal. Lauresham.* and *Moissiacen.* The first coronation of a monarch at the hands of a bishop was that of the Emperor Leo the Thracian by

Twice was the shout repeated, the multitude in this, the most eventful moment that Rome was to witness for centuries, being carried away in a transport of enthusiasm, while the Pope, like another Samuel, anointed the new Caesar of the West and his son Pipin.[1] Leo invested Charles with the Imperial mantle, and, kneeling before him, adored the head of the Roman Empire, crowned of God by his hand.[2] The ceremony ended with the mass, when Charles and Pipin offered the gifts already prepared for the various churches. On S. Peter's they bestowed a silver table with valuable vessels in gold; and on S. Paul's similar gifts. They presented a gold cross, set with precious stones, to the Lateran basilica, and gifts no less valuable to S. Maria Maggiore.

Charles thus renounced the title of Patricius of the Romans, and called himself henceforward Imperator and Augustus. The new title could not

the Patriarch of Byzantium, A.D. 457. The charter of Leo III. for the monastery of Centulum, dated on the day of coronation (Jaffé, n. 1913), has been classed among the *spuria*, a fact which Langen, *Gesch. d. R. Kirche von Leo I.*, &c., p. 781, ought not to have overlooked.

[1] Theophanes (*Chronogr.*, 399) says with malicious exaggeration that Charles was anointed from head to foot; χρίσας ἐλαίῳ ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς ἕως ποδῶν καὶ περιβαλὼν βασιλικὴν ἐσθῆτα καὶ στέφον. The *Chronica Synopsis* of Constant. Manasses (*Dom Bouquet*, v. 397) repeats his account in some verses, in which the Greek schismatic seems to deride the waste of oil; for Byzantines only anointed the head of their Emperors:—

Ἐκ κεφαλῆς μέχρι ποδῶν ἐλαίῳ τοῦτον χρίει,
Οὐκ οἶδα τίσι λογισμοῖς ἢ ποίαις ἐπινοίαις.

[2] *A Pontifice more antiquorum Principum adoratus est. Chron. Moissiac.*

increase the power of a prince who had long been ruler of the West. It expressed, however, the formal recognition of his absolute dominion, and placed him before the world in the "God-given" dignity of a Caesar; a dignity with which he had been invested in Rome, the chief sanctuary of the Church and the ancient seat of the universal monarchy. When, in later times, the German Empire came into conflict with the Papacy, doctors of canon law advanced the theory that the Emperor received the crown solely by favour of the Pope, and traced the investiture to Charles's coronation at the hands of Leo III. The Emperors, on the other hand, appealed to the shout of the people: "Life and victory to the Emperor of the Romans, crowned by God," and asserted that they derived the crown, the inalienable heritage of the Caesars, from God alone. The Romans, on their side, maintained that Charles owed the crown entirely to the majesty of the Roman Senate and people. The dispute as to the actual source of the Imperium continued throughout the entire Middle Ages, and, while exercising no actual change in the world's history, revealed an indwelling need of mankind; the necessity, namely, of referring the world of facts back to a rudimentary right by which power becomes legalised. Pope Leo III. as little possessed the right to bestow the crown of Empire, which was not his, as Charles did to claim it. The Pope, however, regarded himself as the representative of the Empire and of Romanism; and, as the head of Latin nationality, and still more as the recognised spiritual overseer of

Views regarding the legal source of Empire.

the Christian republic, he possessed the power of accomplishing that revolution which, without the aid of the Church, would have been impossible. Mankind at large regarded him as the sacred intercessor between the world and the Divinity; and it was only through his coronation and unction at the papal hands that the Empire of Charles received divine sanction in the eyes of men. The elective right of the Romans, on the other hand, in whatever form it may appear, was uncontested, and in no later Imperial election could it have been of so decisive legal significance. If, in the year 800, the Romans, from whom the new Augustus derived his title, had declared themselves opposed to Charles's election, the Frankish King would either never have become Emperor, or else his Imperial authority, as a usurpation, would have lacked the last semblance of legality. Charles could not therefore be regarded as Emperor in the absence of the consent of either the Pope or the Romans. With the Romans, however, the Franks and other German races, represented in Rome by the scholae of the foreigners, were now associated; and the elective right, which had originally belonged exclusively to the Senate and people of Rome, a right, moreover, never recognised by Charles, lost its significance now that the power of the State rested in the German nation, by which Frankish and German kings were alike elected.

Another question, fruitful of dispute, at the same time presented itself, namely, whether, in the year 800, as the champions of the papal investiture asserted, the Roman Empire had been made over from the

Opinions regarding the translation of the Imperium from the Greeks to the Franks.

Greeks to the Franks by means of the Pope. Were it the case that Leo III. possessed neither the exclusive power nor the right as Pope to bestow the crown of the Empire on the Frankish King, it follows that he could not transmit it from the Greeks to the Franks. The very phrase, "Translation of the Empire," contains merely a half truth.[1] When the design of making Charles Emperor arose, the idea of the unity of the Empire still existed so powerfully as a dogma, that the separation of the West from the East was never even dreamt of. After the fall of Constantine VI., Charles, on the contrary, was to occupy the throne of the Universal Empire considered vacant, not as rival Emperor, but essentially as Emperor and successor of Constantine and Justinian. It was even said that he contemplated marriage with Irene. The Empire was to be transferred, but to a new dynasty, to the Frankish Kings, not to the people of the Franks. It is more than probable that Charles, as well as Leo, believed in the possibility

[1] The question of the translation has been widely disputed. Baronius and Bellarmin (*De translatione imp. Romani adv. Illyricum*) have upheld the doctrine of papal authority; Conrigius (*De imperio Romano-Germanico*), Spanheim (*De ficta transl. imperii*), Goldast (*De transl. Imp. Rom. a Graecis ad Francos*), and others have maintained views contrary to those of the doctors of Canon law. Döllinger (*Ueber das Kaisertum Carl's des Groszen*) has strikingly demonstrated the inaccuracy of the idea of the translation. See also James Bryce, *The Holy Roman Empire*, p. 120. Pütter, *Specimen juris publici et gentium Medii aevi*, Goettingen, 1784, p. 34, well calls Charles's relation to the Empire a personal union. From the mistaken belief, that the Roman Empire was transferred to the Franks and Germans, arose another error, the doctrine of the universal nature of the Imperial monarchy. *De dominio mundi*, p. 164.

of preserving its indivisibility, like that of the Church. But the hope proved a dream. The new Empire remained Western, and never again attained that connection with the East possessed by the ancient State in the time of Honorius and his successors. The offended Greeks invariably regarded it as a usurpation; they complained that the ancient ties between Rome and Byzantium had been severed by the ponderous sword of the Franks, and that Rome's more beautiful daughter, Constantinople, had been separated for ever from her aged mother.[1] A deep chasm henceforward lay between East and West. Church, civil institutions, science and art, customs and ways of life, even recollections of the past were severed from one another. The Greek Empire became orientalised, and remained sunk in numb rigidity during six hundred sad, though honourable, years; while the Roman attained an unexpected degree of vigour in the development of national life in the West.

The Germanic Roman Empire.

Thus the Roman Empire was revived.[2] To the minds of men an ancient form seemed to be restored, but the restoration was merely apparent; for the

[1] Οὕτω μητρὸς καὶ θυγατρὸς μέσον ἐπέπτη σπάθη,
Διχάζουσα καὶ τέμνουσα μετὰ θυμοῦ ῥομφαίας
Νεᾶνιν τὴν εὐπρόσωπον, τὴν νεωτέραν Ῥώμην,
Ἐκ τῆς ῥυσσῆς καὶ παλαιᾶς καὶ τριπεμπέλου Ῥώμης.
—*Constant. Manasses*, 4521 f.

[2] The restoration of the Empire was represented on a leaden seal, the reverse bearing Charles's portrait and the words: *Dominus Noster Karlus Pius Felix Perpetuus Augustus;* the obverse the gate of a city between two towers, surmounted by a cross; below the word *Roma*, and around the inscription: *Renovatio Romani Imp. Vita Leonis III.*, p. 254.

life within was new. Not only was the political principle of this life essentially Teutonic; the Empire itself, by a bold stroke had been removed from the sphere of merely political causes and made dependent on the Divine Will, the fief of which, representing itself as a theocracy, it soon claimed to be. The Church, the Kingdom of God on earth, appeared as the vital principle of which it was itself the civil form, the Catholic body. Without the Church the Empire was impossible. No longer Roman laws, but the institutions of the Church formed the structure and bonds that united the Western nations, and made them a Christian Commonwealth. The civilisation of antiquity, the essence of religion, the ceremonies, the moral law, the priesthood, the Roman language, the festivals, the calendar, everything in short that nations possessed as common property, they derived from the Church. The Roman idea of a universal republic, as of the unity of mankind, found its only visible form in the Church. The Emperor was its head and patron, its promoter and governor, the secular Vicar of Christ. To the nations and peoples who were united under his Empire, and who, willingly or unwillingly, recognised his civil authority, he stood in identically the same relation as the Pope had stood in towards the national churches and metropolitans before he had succeeded in establishing the complete centralisation of the Church. Soon after the time of Charles the Great, the new Caesar of the West possessed neither territorial power nor state authority; his Imperial majesty rested rather on a dogma derived from the laws of nations

than on any international right. It was a power of altogether ideal authority, and devoid of all practical basis.

The appearance of the theocratic principle in the West, distinct from the ancient Roman idea of the State, operated with such effect that, in the course of time, the Church itself or the Pope, the Spiritual Vicar of Christ, became the sole dominating power. The mystic way of looking at the actual world, which prevailed throughout the Middle Ages, and which now appears to us as a purely sophistic toying with symbols, conceived the universe as formed, like man, of the union of soul and body, and made the long-contested dogma of the two natures in Christ, the human and divine, applicable also to the political conception of mankind. This theory redounded to the advantage of the Pope, since the Church was the soul, the State merely the body of Christendom; the Pope the Vicar of Christ in all divine and eternal relations; the Emperor Vicar only in the state, in transient and earthly things; the former the life-giving sun; the latter merely the lesser light, the moon which irradiated the darkness of earth's night. The dualism existing between Emperor and Pope became a contest of principles, and the new Western power, which arose in the year 800, showed itself in the contrast which divided Latinism and Teutonism; a contrast which has influenced and still influences the whole history of Europe. These differences, however, were scarcely apparent, even in their germs, at the time of Charles the Great. Before his Imperial majesty, as before that of the ancient Emperors, paled the splendour

of the Bishop of Rome, who had knelt in adoration before him, and who, like every other bishop in the State, was his subject. After the long tumult caused by the migrations of races, Charles's coronation sealed the reconciliation of the Germans with Rome, the alliance between ancient and modern, the Latin and the German world. Germany and Italy henceforward remained the supporters of civilisation. During long centuries they continued reciprocally acting one upon the other, while beside them and out of the union of the two races other prosperous nations arose, in which now the Latin, now the German, element preponderated. All the life of nations became henceforward bound together in a great concentric system of Church and Empire, and out of this system sprang the common civilisation of Western culture. This dualism held humanity enthralled during so long a course of centuries, and by so strong a spell, that the political organisation of antiquity cannot be compared to it either in power or in duration.

Periods momentous in the history of the universe rarely inspire the wonder of contemporaries, and only succeed in obtaining full recognition from the minds of a later generation. Thus it happened with regard to the coronation of Charles the Great. From the standpoint of after ages scarcely any moment in the annals of the human race attains so high importance. It is a moment of historic creation when, out of the chaos consequent on the dissolution of antiquity and the deluge of wandering tribes, a firm continent arises, on which the history of Europe centres, moved less by mechanical laws of force than by an essentially spiritual power.

# INDEX.


Aachen, cathedral, 373–4.
Actores, 368 note, 392, 449.
Adelberga, Queen of the Angles, 99.
Adelberga, dau. of Desiderius, 376, 412.
Adelbert, King, 99.
Adelchis (Adalgisus), 340, 351; flies to Verona, 353; to Constantinople, 361; plans expulsion of the Franks, 377, 382; death of, 384.
Adelwald, 114, 118.
Adeodatus, Pope, 163.
Adminculator, 445.
Adoption, system of, 174 and note.
Adrian I., Pope, 345; his decree of amnesty, 346 note; relations towards Desiderius, 346; punishes murderers of Sergius, 348; causes Paul Afiarta to be imprisoned, 349; attacked by Desiderius, 350; implores aid of Chas. the Gt., 351; prevails on Desiderius to retreat, 352; receives Chas. the Gt., 355–7; obtains ratification of Pipin's donation, 359; acquisitions on fall of Desiderius, 365–7; tries to acquire the Exarchate, 367–9; claims right of ratifying Archbps. of Ravenna, 372; opposes traffic in slaves, 375; summons Chas. to his defence, 378; defends the Campagna from the Beneventans, 378; baptises Pipin, 379; acquires Beneventan towns, 381; demands restoration of the Sicilian patrimonies, 382 note; restores the walls, 386; aqueducts, 387–9; founds *Domus cultae*, 393–8; diaconates, 402 note; his death, 462; buildings, 398–401; poems, 416; epitaph, 415; grave, 463; *Vita*, 379 note, 388 note.
Adriano, S., ch., 121–2.
Adscripti, 391.
Afiarta, Paul, 335, 337, 338, 346; sent to Desiderius, 347; instigates murder of Sergius, 347–8; his imprisonment and death, 347–50.
Agatha, S., in Subura, ch., 78.
Agathon, Pope, 165–73.
Ager Romanus, 60. *See* also Campagna.
Agilulf, 39, 40, 44, 47, 52, 64.
Agnellus, 202 note, 205.
Agnes, S., legend of, 128.
Agnese, S., *fuori le mura*, ch., 128–30.
Albinus, papal chamberlain, 483, 484.
Alboin, King, conquers N. Italy, 17.
Alboin, Dux, 312.
Alcuin, 414, 415, 491–2; his letter to Chas. the Gt., 587–8, 501 and note.
All Saints, festival of, 112.
All Souls, festival of, 112.
Allo, Dux, 375.
Almo, 61 note.
Altars, 191.

Ambrose (Ambrosius), Archbp., 154.
Ambrosius, Primicerius, 280 note.
Ameria, 251, 259.
Amulets, 76.
Anastasio, S., ad Aquas Salvias, 61 note, 131.
Anastasius, S., 131.
Anastasius II., Emperor, 212–3, 220.
Anastasius, Defensor, 339.
Anathema, ceremony of, 143, 342 note.
Anchard, 254.
Ancona, acquired by the Popes, 365.
Andrea e Gregorio, SS., in Clivus Scauri, 15, 103.
Andrea, S., in Via Labicana, 191 note.
Andrew, S., relics of, 77.
Angaria, 391.
Angelo, S., in Pescaria, ch., 345 note.
Angelo, S., fortress, legend concerning, 33, 102.
Anglo-Saxons, conversion of, 98; scholae of, 428.
Angilbert, 414, 469, 471, 485.
Anibaldi, family, 350 note.
Ansarich, Count, 484.
Antium, 457 and note.
Antius, 273 note.
Apocrisarius, 21.
Apollinare, S., ch., 120.
Apollinare, S., in Classe, ch., 368.
Apollinaris, S., worship of, 120.
Aqua Claudia, 388–9.
  Jovia, 389.
  Sabatina, 387.
  Trajana, 133, 387.
  Virgo, 389.
Aqueducts, under Gregory the Gt., 94; restored, 387–90.
  Count of the, 406 note.
Arator, 86 and note.
Arcarius, 444, 446.
Arce, 193.
Arch, Goldsmith's, 170 note.
  of Janus, 121.
  Janus Quadrifons, 170 note, 171.
Archipresbyter, 32.
Archives of the Church, 92 note.
Arcus Pietatis, 82 note.
  Tres Falciclas, 385.
  Triumphalis Octaviani, 386 note.
Ariald, 118.
Arians, in Rome, 78.
Aribert, 195.
Arichis II. of Benevento, 64, 152.
Arichis III. of Benevento, 312, 376; forms alliance with Adelchis, 377, 382; makes peace with Chas. the Gt., 380; revolts, 380; his relations with the Greeks, 383; death, 384.
Arithmeticians, 413.
Ariulf, 38, 39, 45, 64.
Art, in 8th cent., 246–7, 402.
Artabasdus, 263.
Astolf, King, 267; takes Ravenna, 275; marches against Rome, 275; visited by Stephen II., 280; at war with Pipin, 288–91; invades the Roman Duchy, 290; besieges Rome, 291; raises the siege, 296; makes peace with Pipin, 298; his death, 304.
Astura, 457.
Asylums, 49.
Athanasius of Alexandria, 13, 14.
Athens, in the Middle Ages, 109, 151.
Auchar, Dux, 346, 353, 354.
Augustine, S., his remains, 293.
Augustine, S., Apostle of England, 98.
Augustus, legend of, 199.
Augustus, Vice-comes, 95.
Aunachar, Bp., 23.
Aurelius, Marcus, statue of, 161.
Autharis, King, 22, 24, 38, 39.
Autchar, 278.
Axiomati, 177.

Bagnorea, 366.
Balcernas, 408 and note.
Bandus, 206, 425 and note.
Banner of Rome, 468.

Basilica of Aemilius Paulus, 121.
Juli, 66 and note.
Semproniana, 171 and note.
Theodori, 124–6.
Basilius, 9.
Basil, Dux, 229.
Baths, ruin of, 2.
of Agrippa, 106.
of Agrippina, 95 note.
of Alexander, 106.
of Nero, 106.
Bede, 100, 158–9.
Belfries, 317–8.
Bells, first use of, 317 note.
Benedetto, S., in Piscinula, ch., 5.
Benedict, S., 5–8; founds monastery of Subiaco, 6; of M. Casino, 7; his rule, 8–12; death, 8; remains, 293 note.
Benedict I., Pope, 18.
Benedict II., Pope, 173–5.
Benedict, musician, 413.
Benedict Crispus, 415 and note.
Benedictines, foundation of order of, 9–15, 16.
Benevento, a dukedom, 152; frontiers of, 194, 377–8; acquires independence, 377.
Bertha (Bertrada), wife of Pipin, 281, 340, 344.
Bibliothecarius, 446.
Bishops, suburban, consecrate the Pope, 173 and note.
Blachernae, 408 and note.
Blatta, 211.
Bleda, 40, 251, 259, 350.
Bobbio, monastery, 87.
Boetanium, monastery, 164 note.
Boniface III., Pope, 105.
Boniface IV., 105; consecrates the Pantheon, 110; his death, 113.
Boniface V., 115.
Boniface, S., Apostle of the Germans, 219, 268, 269.
Boniface and Alexius, SS., monastery, 14 note.
Bonitus, 48.
Braisne, Diet of, 287.
Brandea, 74.
Bridges, ancient, 386 note. *See* also Pons and Ponte.
Burchard, Bp., 269.
Burgus Saxonum, 429.

Cadwalla, 187–8, 415.
Callinicus, Exarch, 64.
Calvisianum, 393, 394–5.
Campagna, condition of, in 6th cent., 60–1, 193–4; in 8th, 272–4; owes military duty to the city, 351 note; land tenure in, 391–3.
Campagnano, 398 note.
Campania, 456–9; Duces in, 457–8 and note.
Campulus, Sacellarius, 481–2, 490, 497.
Campus Martius, 105, 390.
Capracorum, 395–8; militia of, 397.
Carloman, son of Chas. Martel, 258; becomes monk, 264; his death, 287.
Carloman, son of Pipin, anointed, 281; King, 332; his attitude towards Stephen III., 336, 340; death, 344.
Carloman, son of Chas. the Gt., 379. *See* Pipin.
Casa di Boetio, 171 note.
Cassiodorus, 12.
Castellum Felicitatis, 365 and note.
Castorius, 21, 45, 47.
Catacombs, sacked by the Lombards, 292–3 and note; under Paul I., 320.
Catacombs of Hermes and Hippolytus, 27.
Cecilia, S. *Domus culta*, 273.
Centumcellae. *See* Civita-Vecchia.
Cesario, S., oratory, 67 note.
Charles the Great, consecrated by the Pope, 281; King, 332; sends bishops to Italy, 332; marries Desiderata, 342; repudiates her, 344; marries Hildegard, 344; summoned to Italy, 351; marches against Desiderius, 353; besieges Pavia, 354; in Rome, 354; confirms Pipin's donation, 359, 365–

7; as Patricius, 355, 360, 372; takes Pavia and the Iron Crown, 361; claims right of appointing Archbps. of Ravenna, 371; removes marbles to Aachen, 374; opposes traffic in slaves, 375; third time in Italy, 379; fourth, 380; subjugates Arichis, 380; bestows fresh donation on the Church, 381; makes Grimoald II. Duke of Benevento, 384; relations with Leo III., 463–7; receives him at Paderborn, 485; brings Paschalis to trial, 490; fifth time in Italy, 492; holds parliament in Rome, 493–6; crowned Emperor, 504–5; his gifts to Roman churches, 505; as poet, 415.
Charles Martel, 251, 252–6.
Chartularii, 440 and notes.
Childebert, 23, 38, 76.
Childeric III., 268–9.
Chlodwig, 23.
Choristers, school of, 91.
Chosroes, 116, 131, 132.
Christ, representations of, 222 and note; picture of, in S. Sanctorum, 247, 277 and note.
Christians, faction of, 210, 212.
Christophorus, Dux, 210.
Christophorus, Primicerius of the Notaries, 326; goes to Desiderius, 327; raises Stephen III. to the Papacy, 329; revolts against him, 336; surrenders to him, 337; his death, 338; rehabilitated, 349.
Chrodegang of Metz, 278.
Chrysogonus, S., ch., 247.
Church, growth of power of, 4–5, 54, 236.
Church, State of the, 61, 238–40, 249; acquisitions through Pipin, 282, 289, 298–304; through Desiderius, 259, 305; acquisitions after his fall, 365; through Chas. the Gt., 381. See also Patrimony and Patrimonium.
Churches, in 8th cent., 402 note.
Cicero, his Republic, 93.
Circus Maximus, 2, 406.
Ciriaco, S., in Via Ostiense, ch., 128.
Citonatus, Bp., 325.
Città di Castello, 365 note.
Civita-Vecchia (Centumcellae), 248, 449 and note.
Clergy, as order of the people, 176, 420.
Cloaca Maxima, 171.
*Codex Argenteus*, 87 note.
*Codex Carolinus*, 252 note.
Coemeterium of Petronilla, 319 and note.
Coins, earliest papal, 477 note.
Coloni, 58, 391–3.
Colosseum, 2, 158–60, 331 note.
Columba, S., 87 and note.
Column of Phocas, 67–9.
Comacchio, acquired by the Pope, 298.
Comes Campanae, 453 note.
Comites, 367 note, 445, 453.
Comitium, 121.
Conditionales, 391.
Conductores, 58, 368 note, 392.
Conon, Pope, 176, 179.
Conrad of Mercia, 189.
Constans II., Emperor, 141, 145; visits the West, 150–2; Rome, 153–8; despoils the Pantheon, 160; furthers schism, 165; death, 162.
Constantina (Constantia), Empress, 45, 74.
Constantine the Great, 161; his donation, 362–4.
Constantine V., Copronymus, 240, 245, 263, 276, 277, 296.
Constantine VI., 382, 499.
Constantine, Pope, 201; goes to Constantinople, 203; returns, 204; restores peace in Rome, 212; his death, 213.
Constantine, brother of Toto, pseudo-Pope, 324; letter to Pipin, 325–6; overthrown, 328; mutilated, 331; before Lateran Synod, 332; his end, 333.

Constantine, Defensor, 245.
Consul, title of, 434–6.
Consularis of Ravenna, 349 note.
Consuls in 8th cent., 244, 434–6.
Convents, 11–2; in Rome, 12, 13; universally entered, 55; entrance forbidden to soldiers, 55.
Coronation of monarchs, 504 note.
Corsicans, oppressed by Byzantines, 99 note.
Cosma and Damiano, SS., ch., 123.
Council, Lateran, of 649, 145–6; Sixth Oecumenical, 166; its decrees annulled, 208; Trullan, 182; of 731, 244–5; of 743, 263; Second, of Nicea, 382.
Cross, the True, 132.
Crucifixes, 222 note.
Cubicularius, 446, 447.
Cumae, conquered by the Lombards, 218.
Cura Palatii Urbis Romae, 211.
Cures, 460 and note.
Curia Senatus, 121.
Curtis, 392.
Cymelia, 190 note, 403.
Cyrus, Patriarch, 142, 146, 167, 203.

Damian, Archbp., 184, 206.
Deacons, 57.
Decapolis, 343 note.
Decuriones, 52, 55 note; 435 note.
Defensor, title of, 285 and note, 360, 439, 445 note; Primus, 444, 446.
Defensores, college of, 445–5.
Demetrius, Secundicerius, 328.
Desiderata, 340; marries Chas. the Gt., 342; repudiated, 344.
Desiderius, King, cedes Lombard cities to the Pope, 305; subjugates Spoleto and Benevento, 312; in Rome, 312; attitude towards Constantine, 327; relations with Adrian I., 346; requests consecration for sons of Carloman, 347; occupies part of the Exarchate, 347; marches against Rome, 350; retires, 352; retires before the Franks, 353; surrenders to Chas., 361.
Deusdedit, Pope, 113–5.
Diaconates, 402 note.
Dodo, Count, 336, 339.
*Dominium temporale*, 303. *See* State of the Church.
*Dominium utile*, 298.
Domnius, Bp., 138.
*Domus cultae*, 272–4, 393–8.
Donus, Pope, 164.
Donus, Magister Militum, 140.
Droctegang of Görz, 278.
Ducatus Romanus, 209, 213 note; circumference of, 449–52.
Duces, Greek, 423; Papal, 437, 449–52; Majores, 450; Minores, 450.
Dux of Rome, 46, 213 note, 250, 261 and note; abolition of, 423, 437; in 8th cent., 449.

Easter Stations, 357–8 and note.
Ecthesis, 134, 142, 146.
Edistius, *Domus culta*, 61 note, 394, 395.
Education, about 600, 87–9.
Eginhard, 503.
Electoral bodies, 176–8.
Eleutherius, Exarch, 114, 115.
Eleutherius of Ravenna, 370.
Emperors, ceremonial of their reception, 154.
Empire, Western, revival of, 497–512. *See* also Imperium.
England, conversion of, 98, 103.
Epitaphs, 414.
Equitii, S., titulus, 149. *See* Silvestro and Martino, SS.
Equitius, Senator, 6.
Equitius of Valeria, 9.
Erasmus, S., 163 note.
Erasmus, S., monastery, 163, 482.
Erasmus, S., on Soracte, 265 note.
Ermengard. *See* Desiderata.
Erogator, 47.
Etherius, 358.

Eugenius I., Pope, 149.
Eunuchs, traffic in, 375.
Euphemia, S., ch., 32 note, 164 note.
Euplus, S., ch., 144.
Eustachius, Dux, 368, 451.
Eustochium, 14.
Eustratius, Bp., 325.
Eutyches, Abbot, 142.
Eutychius, Exarch, goes to Naples, 231; reinstated, 240; marches against Rome, 241; at war with Petasius, 242; presents columns to S. Peter's, 245; deposed, 275.
Exarchate, end of, 275, 282; ceded to the Pope, 298–9.
Exarchs, ratify papal elections, 116–7, 145, 179; series of, 114 note.
Ex-consul, title, 436 note.
Exercitus Romanus, 135, 145–6, 176, 249 note, 425.
Exhilaratus, Dux, 231.
Exile as punishment, 348–9, 497 note.
*Ex memorialis*, 440.

*Familia*, 391.
Famine, 104.
Farfa, monastery, 193; Abbot of, sent to Desiderius, 350.
Faroald, Duke (about 598), 18.
Faroald, Duke (about 683), 193.
Feet-washing, ceremony of, 56 note, 388 note.
Felix, Archbp. of Ravenna, 202.
Felix, grammarian, 411.
Fermo, acquired by the Pope, 365.
Fidenae, 460 note.
Flavian, grammarian, 411.
Folrad, Abbot, 269, 280, 288, 302, 305.
Fontejana, Massa, 272.
Formia Jovia, 389 note.
Formiae Massa, 273 and note.
Fortunatus, Venantius, Bp., 84.
Forum Romanum, 123.
Trajanum, 83–5.
Franks, school of, 305.
Frisians. in Rome, 429.
Fundus, 60.
Mercurianus, 395 note.
Pompeianus, 395 note.

Gabi, 273, 460 note.
Gaeta, 378.
Galeria, 393, 394.
Gallese, 249, 250.
Garamanus, Dux, 374.
George, S., 169–70. *See* also Giorgio.
George, Patriarch, 167
George, son of Johannicius, 185, 206.
George, Bp., 352.
George, Bp., of Portus, 203.
George, Bp., of Praeneste, 324, 325.
Germanus, Bp., 247.
Germanus, Bp. of Capua, 79.
Germanus, Prefect, 31.
Gilberga, 342; escapes to Desiderius, 346, 351; flies to Verona, 353; surrenders to the Franks, 354.
Giorgio, S., in Velabro, ch., 170–2.
Giovanni, S., in Oleo, ch., 405.
Giovanni e Paolo, SS. (John and Paul), 15,
Giovanni, S., a Porta Latina, 404.
Gisela, 309, 340.
Gisulf II. of Benevento, 193.
Gloriosus, title of, 451.
Godschalk, 250.
Gordian, 30, 100.
Gracilis, Tribune, 330.
Grammarians, 413.
Granaries, of the Church, 38.
Graphia, 285.
Gratiosus, Chartularius, 328, 329; Dux, 330; causes Constantine to be mutilated, 331; escapes to the Pope, 337, 440.
Greek, ignorance of, in Rome, 88, 173.
Greeks, their possessions about 660, 151–2, 375; their officials, 48–53; traffic in slaves, 375.
Gregorio, S., ch., 102.
Gregory the Great, his ancestry and youth, 30–1; as Nuncio in Con-

stantinople, 21 ; returns to Rome, 24 ; builds S. Andrea in Clivo Scauri, 15 ; his account of the pestilence, 26 ; erects convents in Sicily, 31 ; elected Pope, 30 ; holds penitential procession, 32 ; ordained, 35 ; brings corn from Sicily, 38 ; purchases retreat of the Lombards, 45 ; correspondence with Maurice, 45 ; letter to Leontius, 49 ; protects threatened officials, 50 ; letters to Rusticiana, 54 note ; administration of Church property, 56–9 ; determines the modius, 58 ; makes peace with the Lombards, 64 ; relations with Phocas, 65 ; attitude towards relic-worship, 74 ; towards image worship, 224–5 ; consecrates S. Agatha, 78 ; accused of destroying monuments, 92–3 ; begs for restoration of aqueducts, 95 ; in opposition to John Jejunator, 96 ; sends Augustine to England, 98 ; his death, 99 ; his buildings, 100–3 ; his sermons, 37 ; homilies, 41 ; dialogues, 80 ; portrait, 101 ; grave, 99 note ; legends concerning him, 81.

Gregory II., 217 ; his rule, 218–20 ; defends image-worship, 228 ; refuses tax levied by the Emperor, 229 ; excommunicates the Exarch, 229 ; adheres to the Emperor, 230 ; letters to him, 232–5 ; induces Liutprand to retire, 238–9 ; turns for aid to Venice, 239 ; besieged by Liutprand, 241 ; persuades him to withdraw, 242 ; his death, 243 ; gifts to S. Peter's, 274.

Gregory III., 243 ; his Council, 244 ; acquires Gallese, 249 ; protects Trasamund, 250 ; letters to Chas. Martel, 252–5 ; his buildings, 247–8 ; death, 256.

Gregory, Dux, 21.

Gregory (Gregorius), Dux, 451 and note.

Gregory, envoy of Constantine V., 297.

Gregory, Prefect, 45, 49, 50.

Gregory of Ravenna, 370.

Gregory, Bp. of Tours, 24.

Grimoald I. of Benevento, seizes Lombard throne, 152.

Grimoald II., 384.

Grimoald III., 384, 492.

Guilds, 426.

Gulfard, 352.

Hair, transmission of locks of, 174 and note, 309.

Haroun al Raschid, 466–7.

Hell, supposed site of, 79.

Heracleonas, 141.

Heraclius, Emperor, 114, 116 ; despoils Temple of Venus and Rome, 120 ; sends head of S. Anastasius to Rome, 131 ; a Monothelite, 142.

Heraclius Constantinus, Emperor, 141.

Hilary, Pope, his buildings, 137.

Hildebald, Archbp., 484, 489.

Hildebrand, Duke, 365, 377.

Hildegard, 344, 354, 379.

Hildeprand, Prince, 240 ; King, 262.

Honorius I., Pope, 116 ; his buildings, 118–33 ; erects mills, 133 ; his death, 134 ; anathematised, 167.

Horses, papal, 59 note.

Horta, 40, 251, 259.

Iconoclasts, 245, 292.

Ignorance in Rome, 411.

Image worship, 220–7 ; edict against, 227–8 ; restored, 382 and note.

Immo, 308.

Imperium, 506–8 ; its translation to the Franks, 508–9 and notes.

Ina, King, 428–9.

Inscriptions. *See* Epitaphs.

Insula Sacra, 394.

Investiture, under Chas. the Gt., 373 note.
Irene, Empress, restores image worship, 382; seeks alliance with Chas. the Gt., 383, 508; puts out eyes of Constantine VI., 499.
Isaac, Exarch, 116; robs Lateran treasury, 135; at war with Maurice, 140; his death, 140; tomb, 140–1.

Jacobus de Voragine, 170 note.
Jerome, S., 14.
Jews, Schola of, 427.
Johannes Diaconus (John the Deacon), 30 note, 77, 88–9, 100.
Johannicius, 184–5, 202.
John, S., Evangelist, robe of, 77; legend of, 404–5.
John, S., Baptist, head of, 322. *See* also Giovanni.
John III., Pope, 18.
John IV., 136; rejects the Ecthesis, 142.
John V., 175.
John VI., 192; induces Gisulf to retire, 193; his death, 194.
John VII., 195; his parents, 211; buildings, 196–7; death, 196; restores Subiaco, 200.
John of Compsa, 114.
John Jejunator, 96.
John Lemigius, Exarch, 114.
John Platina, Exarch, 179.
John Rizokopus, Exarch, 204.
John Silentiarius, 279.
John and Paul, SS., monastery, 15.
Jordan, Chartularius, 229.
Judices of Rome, 177, 441; of Ravenna, 368 and note; de Militia, 178, 232, 445; Ordinari, 446; Palatini, 446; de Clero, 178, 445; Dativi, 441 note.
Justin the Younger, Emperor, sends corn to Rome, 18.
Justin, Praetor, 38.
Justinian II., Emperor, 179, 182; at variance with Sergius I., 183; dethroned, 185; reinstated, 195; punishes Ravenna, 201–2; absolved by the Pope, 204; his death, 208.
Juturna, 171.

Keys of the Apostle's grave, 254 and notes, 464, 466–7 and notes.
Kiersey, treaty of, 282.
Kleph, 18.

*Lacus Orphei*, 127.
Lateran, Baptistery, 136–7; Basilica, 20; decorated by Adrian I., 401; Palace, 270–2; portico restored, 401; the Triclinium Majus, 474–9; Cellaria, 331 note; Vestiarium, 447.
Latin, decay of, 416–8.
Latium, 194.
Laurata, 65.
Laurentius. *See* Lawrence and Lorenzo.
Lauretum, *Domus culta*, 272.
Law, in 8th cent., 440–1.
Lawrence, S., 27. *See* also Lorenzo.
Lawrence, Archdeacon, 24.
Learning, condition of, in 8th cent., 411.
Leo the Isaurian, Emperor, 220; prohibits worship of images, 227; imposes tax on Rome, 229; his correspondence with the Pope, 232–5; sends fleet against Italy, 248; annexes estates in Sicily, 248; his death, 256.
Leo II., Pope, 173, 184.
Leo III., 463; sends keys of Apostle's grave to Chas. the Gt., 464; restores S. Susanna, 473; builds the Triclinium Majus, 474–9; attempt on life of, 480–3; goes to Paderborn, 483; meeting with Chas., 485; back in Rome, 489; receives Chas. the Gt., 494; takes oath of purgation, 496; crowns Chas. Emperor, 504.

Leo, Archdeacon, 343; Archbp. of Ravenna, 344; orders death of Paul Afiarta, 349; occupies part of the Exarchate, 369; goes to Chas. the Gt., 369; forms alliance with Adelchis, 377.
Leoninus, Consul, 395 note.
Leontia, 65.
Leontias, Dux, 63.
Leontius, Emperor, 185, 192.
Leontius, Ex-Consul, 48–9.
Leucius, S., *Domus culta*, 394–5.
Lewis (the Pious), son of Chas. the Gt., 379.
*Libellus securitatis*, 58.
*Liber Diurnus*, 116, 417.
*Pontificalis*, 100, 114, 133, 146, 153, 164, 209, 244, 249, 256, 417.
Libraries, 92–3.
Library, Palatine, 92.
Papal, 92 and note.
*Lingua volgare*, rise of, 416–9.
Liutprand, King, 217, 237; takes Ravenna, the Pentapolis, Narni and Sutri, 238; presents Sutri to the Pope, 238; surrenders the Exarchate, 240; attacks Rome, 241; retires, 242; victorious over Trasamund, 250; makes treaty with Zacharias, 258; bestows fresh donation on the Church, 259; buys remains of S. Augustine, 293; his death, 262.
Liutprand, Duke, 312.
Lombards, conquer Italy, 16–20; besiege Rome (593), 18; their duchies, 18, 376–7; conversion, 80, 193; passion for relics, 293.
Longinus, Exarch, 22.
Lorenzo, S., ch., 27; mosaics in, 28–9; rebuilt by Pelagius II., 27–9; restored by Stephen II., 317.
S., in Damaso, 106.
in Lucina, 106.
in Miranda, 122.
Lucia, S., in Silice (in Orphea), ch., 127.
Luke, S., his portraits of the Madonna, 34; his arm, 77.
Lupercal, Lupercalia, 125.

Macarius, 167.
Magister Militum, 46.
Mallones, 175 note.
Mansuarii, 391.
Marcella, 13–4, 15 note.
Maria, S., in Adriano, ch., 398–9 note.
Antiqua, 407 note.
in Aquiro (in Campo Marzo), 82 note, 247.
in Cosmedin, 406–9 and notes; mosaics in, 196.
in Foro, 123.
de Inferno, 123 and note.
Nova, 409 note.
Rotunda, 113, 407 note.
in Schola Greca. *See* in Cosmedin.
del Secundicerio, 443 note.
Traspontina, 398 note.
Marinus, Cardinal, 311.
Marinus, Dux, 229.
Mariolatry, 72.
Mars, Field of. *See* Campus Martius.
Maritima, 458.
Martin I., Pope, 144; a prisoner, 148; his trial and death, 148; grave, 149; festival, 149.
Martin, S., monastery, 317.
Martina, S., ch., 122.
Martina, Empress, 141.
Martyrs, pictures of, 223 and note.
Massa, 60, 391.
Fontejana, 272.
Maurice, Emperor, 21, 31; relations with the Franks, 23; letter to Gregory the Gt., 45; forbids soldiers to enter the cloister, 55; 62, 64; his death, 65.
Maurice, Chartularius, 135, 139–40.
Mauritius, Dux of Perugia, 40.
Mauritius, Dux of Rimini, 343.
Maurus, S., 6.
Maurus of Nepi, 483.
Maurus of Ravenna, 165.

Mausoleum of Hadrian. *See* S. Angelo.
of Honorius, 319.
Maximus, Abbot, 154.
Mentana. *See* Nomentum.
Michael of Ravenna, 343–4.
Michele, S., in Sassia, ch., 429.
Milan, conquered by Alboin, 17.
Miles, significance of, 177 note, 425.
Miliciae Capracorum, 397 and notes.
Militia, Roman, 19, 145, 422–4, 438–9.
Miracles, belief in, 77–8.
Misenum, 148 note.
Mitre, papal, 203 and note.
Modius, 58.
Monasticism, Monks, 12–13; before time of Benedict, 9; Greek, 321.
Monophysites, 142.
Monothelites, 141; condemnation of, 166–7.
Mons Palatiolus, 430.
Monte Casino, Abbey, 7; destroyed by the Lombards, 20, 200.
Testaccio, 409–10 and note.
Monuments, 94.
Mosaics, 402.
Music, Musicians, 413–4.
Mythographers, 414.

Narni, ceded to the Pope, 259.
Nepi, 323, 395.
Nepotism, 480.
Nobility, Roman, 176, 437–9.
Nomenculator, 434, 445, 446.
Nomentum (Mentana), 461, 493 and note.
Nonantula, monastery, 267 note.
Norma, a papal fief, 263 and note.
Notary of the Regions, 443.
Notitia Ecclesiarum, 401 note.
Novas, 355 and note.
Numerus Militum, 207 note, 425, 439.
Nuns, number of, in Rome, 15.
Nunneries, 13.
Nympha (Ninfa), 263 and note.

Odeum, 106.
Offa, 189, 429.
Officials, papal, in 8th cent., 442–8.
Olympius, Exarch, 145, 146–7.
Optimates of the army, 177, 433, 438.
Oratorium Caesarii, 66.
Ordo, 53
Romanus, 358 note.
Oreste, S., 265 note.
Originarii, 391.
Orosius, Bp., 199.
Osimo, a papal fief, 259, 365.

Paganism, in 8th cent., 6–7, 86 and note, 90 and note.
Palatine, palace, dwelling of the Exarch, 40; condition of, in 7th cent., 1–2, 157–8; in 8th, 210–2; silence concerning, 357.
Palatium Neronis, 430 note.
Pallacenae, 95 note.
Pammachius, Senator, 56.
Pamphronius, Patrician, 19.
Pancratius, S., 132.
Pancrazio, S., ch., 132–3.
Pantheon, 106–13; consecrated as church, 110–2; robbed of gilt tiles, 160.
Paolo, S., *fuori le mura*, 399, 401.
Papal Court, 441–8.
Papal election, conceded to the Romans, 173; influence of Exarchs on, 117, 179–80; decision of 769 concerning, 333; right of Patricius over, 463–4.
Paracellarius, 331 note.
Parthenon, 109.
Paschalis, nephew of Adrian I., 480; his attack on Leo III., 481–2; tried, 490; banished, 497.
Paschalis, Archdeacon, 179–80.
Paschalis, brother of Toto, 324.
Passivus, 324, 328.
Patricius, title, 51 note, 283; of the Romans, 283–6; renounced by Chas. the Gt., 505; of Sicily, 378.
Patrimony of the Church, 59–61, 195 note, 249, 259, 365–70.

Patrimonium Appiae, 59.
Labicanense, 59.
Savinense, 367.
Tiburtinum, 59.
Urbanum, 60.
Patroni of the Scholae, 425 and note.
Patronus, meaning of, 355 note, 425.
Paul, S., mode of depicting, 227; churches dedicated to, *see* Paolo.
Paul I., Pope, his election, 307; attitude towards Pipin, 308–9; towards Desiderius, 311–2; towards the Emperors, 314; his buildings, 321; death, 323–4.
Paul, brother of Stephen II., 276, 305. *See* Paul I.
Paul, Patriarch, 141, 143, 146.
Paulinus of Nola, 317 note.
Paulus Diaconus (Paul the Deacon), 412; his history, 8, 25, 84, 167, 194.
Paulus, Exarch, 229, 237.
Pavia, besieged by Chas. the Gt., 353–4, 360–1
Pelagius I., Pope, 495.
Pelagius II., 19; seeks aid in Constantinople, 19, 21; his relations with the Franks, 23; builds S. Lorenzo, 27; his death, 27.
Pensio, 58.
Pentapolis, 183; resists the Greeks, 229; conquered by Liutprand, 238; becomes papal property, 282, 298–9.
Pentapolis Maritima, 343 note.
Mediterranea, 343 note.
Perugia (Perusia), a duchy, 455.
Pestilence, of 542–90, 25–7, 52; of 680, 167.
Peter, S., his marriage, 318 note; growing veneration for, 186; his statue, 226–7, 234; as Patricius, 372; letter to Pipin, 294–5; amulets of his chains, 75; mode of depicting, 227.
Peter's, S., Basilica, decorated by Honorius I., 118–21; by Adrian I., 398; roofed with tiles, 120; doors of, 118–9, 399; belfry, 317; atrium paved, 164, 399; shrine, 118, 245, 399; mosaics of John VII., 196; chapel of S. Apollinare, 120; candelabra, 119; lamps, 400–1; monastery of, 15; tombs in, 190–1; colonnade, 399.
Peter's Pence, 429.
Peter, S., in Campo Meruli, 163 note.
Peter and Paul, SS., on the Via Sacra, 322 note.
Peter, S. *See also* Pietro.
Peter of Alexandria, 14.
Peter, Arch Presbyter, 175.
Peter, Deacon, 80.
Peter, Patriarch, 149.
Peter of Pisa, 415.
Peter of Ravenna, 210, 213, 231.
Petronilla, S., legend of, 318–20 and notes; cemetery of, 319 and note.
Philip, Pope, 328–9.
Philip, Presbyter, 368.
Philippicus Bardanes, 208, 209, 212.
Philosophers, banished from Athens, 7.
Phocas, Emperor, 65; pronounces Rome the head of Christendom, 105; presents Pantheon to Boniface IV., 109; his column, 67–9.
Physicians, Roman, 87.
Pietro, S., ad Vincula, 168.
Pilgrims, pilgrimages in 8th cent., 56, 186–90, 354, 429 and note.
Pipin, adopted by Liutprand, 254; King of the Franks, 268; obtains papal sanction to his usurpation, 269; summons Stephen II. to France, 278; anointed, 281; makes treaty with Stephen, 282; Patricius, 283; makes war on the Lombards, 288; donation to Stephen, 289, 298–9; second expedition to Italy, 295; attitude

towards Paul I., 308; writes to the Romans, 309; his death, 331.
Pipin, son of Chas. the Gt., 379, 380; at war with Adelchis, 384; receives Leo III., 484–5; at war with Grimoald, 492; in Rome, 503.
Placidus, S., 6.
Plato, father of John VI., 211.
Poetry in 8th cent., 414–5.
Polimartium, 40, 251, 259.
Pons Antoninus, 386 and note.
Ponte a Galera, 394.
Sisto, 386.
Pontifex Maximus, 97 note.
Pope, growing power of, 54–6, 181–2, 269; titles of, 96–7 note, ratified by Exarch, 117; controls Greek officials, 53; right of pardon of, 322 note; as temporal prince, 378; administration of, 437.
Populonia, 366.
Populus, signification of, 177 note.
Populus Romanus, 209.
Porta S. Petri in Hadrianeo, 398.
del Torrione, 430.
Portico of S. Lorenzo, 399.
of S. Paolo, 399.
of S. Pietro, 398–9.
Porticus Pallacinae, 386.
Palmaria, 120.
Portus, 375, 394.
Portus Romani, 394.
Potho, Abbot, 491 note.
Praefectus Italiae, 47 and note.
Praetorio, 47.
Urbis, 47, 50, 348 and note, 441.
Prefects, 47.
Presbyteria, 444.
Primates Exercitus, 177.
Primicerius Defensorum, 444.
Notariorum, 434, 443, 446, 480.
Scholarum, 424.
Principia, 13.
Probus, Abbot, 53, 64.
*Proceres Cleri*, 447.
Proconsul of Italy, 47.
Procopius, 25.
Protoserinarius, 446.
Purgatory, 79 and note.
Pyrrhus, Patriarch, 141–3, 146, 167.

Quattro Coronati, SS., ch., 126–7.
Quertinus, 48.

Rachimpert, 328.
Rachis, King, 262; besieges Perugia, 266; becomes monk, 266; at war with Desiderius, 305; returns to the cloister, 305.
Ravenna, Archbishopric of, 165; militia of, 183; revolts against the Greeks, 185; punished, 201–2; popular games in, 205; revolts under George, 206; conquered by Liutprand, 238; by the Venetians, 240; by Astolf, 275; condition under Stephen III., 343; right of Popes over, 367–8, 371–2; works of art removed, 373.
Reccared, 76.
Rectores Patrimonii, 57.
Rectors, 58, 392.
Reginald, Dux, 369; forms alliance with Adelchis, 377.
Relics, worship of, 73–7, 320.
Remigius, 313.
Reparatus of Ravenna, 165.
Respublica, 249, 453.
Rieti (Reate) makes submission to the Pope, 365; boundaries of, 367 and note.
Rimini, Duces of, 343 and note.
Ripa Graeca, 407.
Rodgausus, 377.
Romanus, Anchorite, 6.
Romanus, Exarch, 39, 40, 64.
Romescot, 428.
Romuald, son of Arichis, 380.
Romuald of Benevento, 152–3, 241.

Rosellae, 366.
Rothard, Duke, 280.
Rotharis, 139.
Rotrudis, dau. of Rachis, 266.
Rotrudis, dau. of Chas. the Gt., 383.
Rusticiana, 54 note.
Rutilius Claudius Namatianus, 13 note.

Sabina, ceded to the Popes, 259, 366; marchioness of, 367; rectors of, 367 note; circumference of, 459–60.
Sabinian, Pope, 94, 104–5.
Saccellarius, 434, 444, 446.
Sacconi, 206 note.
Sacra, 208.
Saints, worship of, 73, 170; Slavonian, 138; tutelary, 355 note.
Salvatore, S., in Macello, ch., 430.
de Ossibus, 431.
in Via Ostiensis, 144.
Sancta Sanctorum, 270; portrait of Christ in, 247.
Saracens, conquer Syracuse, 162; Sardinia, 248.
Schism, Istrian, 119; of Ravenna, 165–7.
Schola Anglorum, 428.
Francorum, 430.
Frisonum, 429.
Graecorum, 407, 427.
Langobardorum, 431.
Militiae, 177, 439 note.
Saxonum, 428–9.
Scholae, 424; Peregrinorum, 427.
Scholastica, S., 6, 8, 293 note.
Scholasticus, Exarch, 212.
Schools in 8th cent., 411–3.
Scultenna, battle, 139.
Sebastian, S., 168.
Sebastiano, S., fuori, ch. 168.
Secundicerius Notariorum, 442, 446.
Secundinus, Bp., 224.
See, administration of ch. during vacancy of, 32, 443.
Senate, imperial, 51; under Pipin, 311; silence concerning, 432; as distinction of the aristocracy, 432–4. Palace of, *see* Curia.
Sepulcrum Romuli, 164.
Scipionis, 164 and note.
Serenus, Bishop, 224.
Serfs, serfdom. *See* Villenage.
Sergius I., Pope, 180; rejects articles of Trullan Council, 182; a prisoner, 182; his buildings and votive gifts, 190–1.
Sergius, Patriarch, 134, 142, 146, 167.
Sergius, Archbp. of Ravenna, 315, 332, 343.
Sergius, Sacellarius, 327; overthrows Constantine, 327; goes to France, 331; his position in Rome, 334; heads revolt against Stephen III., 335; surrendered to the Pope, 337; blinded, 338; rehabilitated, 349.
Sergius and Bacchus, SS., convent, 270.
*Servi terrae*, 391, 392.
Severus, S., 127.
Severinus, S., 79, 127.
Severinus, Pope, 134, 136.
Sicily, granary of Rome, 38, 58; domains of S. Apollinare in, 368; patriciate of, 378.
Silvestro in Capite, S., monastery, 321–2.
Silvestro e Martino, SS., ch., 149.
Sisinnius, Pope, 201.
Sisinnius, Presbyter, 90 note.
Sixtus III., builds Lateran Baptistery, 136–7.
Slaves, traffic in, 375.
Smaragdus, Exarch, 22, 68.
Soana, property of the Popes, 366.
Sora, 193–4 and note.
Soracte, Monte, 264–5.
Spirito, S., Hospital, 429.
Spoleto, Duchy, 18; frontiers of, 460; makes submission to the Pope, 365; belongs to Frankish kingdom, 365.

Squillace, convent of, 12.
Stadium, 106.
Statues, removed by Constans, 160; fall to the Saracens, 162.
Stephen, S., his remains, 27.
Stephen II., Pope, 274; holds negotiations with Astolf, 276; implores aid from Pipin, 278; journeys to Astolf, 280; to Pipin, 280–1; consecrates him, 281; treaty with him, 282; receives donation for the ch., 289; again implores Pipin's aid, 290; acquires the Exarchate, 298–304; supports Desiderius, 305; incites Spoleto and Benevento to revolt, 312; his death, 306; buildings, 317–8.
Stephen III., 329; writes to Pipin, 331; alliance with Desiderius, 336; share in fall of Christophorus and Sergius, 336–9; warns Frankish princes against Lombard marriages, 340–2; sets in order affairs of Ravenna, 349; his death, 345.
Stephen, Dux of Naples, 351.
Stephen, Dux of Rome, 261, 435.
Stephen, Presbyter, 324. *See* Stephen III.
Subaugusta, 273 and note.
Subdeacons, 57.
Subiaco, name, 6 note; monastery founded, 6; destroyed and restored, 200.
Superista Palatii, 447 and note.
Susanna, S., ch., 190; mosaics in 473, 477.
Sutri, presented to the Pope, 238.
Swaddling clothes, 309.
Swords, consecration of, 311 note.
Synod, of 769, 332–3.
Synodica, 149.
Syracuse, in the Middle Ages, 162.
Sylvester, S., monastery, 265. *See* also Silvestro.

Tabelliones, 440.
Taberna juxta Pallacenas, 95 note.
Tapestries, manufacture of, 403; in the churches, 271, 400, 403.
Tasia, 266–7.
Tecla, S., convent, 317.
Temples, transformed into churches, 111–2.
Temple of Antoninus and Faustina, 122.
of Fortuna Virilis, 406.
of Hercules, 406.
of Janus Quadrifons, 171 note.
of Jupiter, 157.
of Minerva Chalcidia, 106.
of Pudicitia Patricia, 406.
of Rome and Venus, 120, 158.
of Romulus, 125.
of Vesta, 405.
Templum divi Adriani, 82 note.
Sacrae Urbis, 122.
Teodoro, S., ch., 124–6.
Terra Laboris, 148 note.
Terracina, 378, 379, 459.
Tertullus, Patrician, 6.
Theatre of Balbus, 386 note.
Theatrum Antonini, 386 note.
Theodatus, Primicerius, 345, 451 note, 480.
Theodicius, Duke, 327, 396 note.
Theodolinda, 39, 64 note, 76 and note, 98.
Theodora II., Empress, 382 note.
Theodore, S., 124.
Theodore, Pope, 139; receives Pyrrhus, 141; anathematises him and Paul, 143; his death, 143; buildings, 144.
Theodore, Bp., 328.
Theodore, Archbp. of Ravenna, 165.
Theodore Kalliopa, Exarch, 141, 147, 185.
Theodore, musician, 413.
Theodore, nephew of Adrian I., 480.
Theodore, Patricius, 201.
Theodore, Presbyter, 175.
Theodoric the Gt., palace of, 373; statue of, 374 note.

Theodosius, Emperor, 220.
Theoktista, 21.
Theophylactus, Archdeacon, 307.
Theophylactus, Exarch, 192.
Thermae. *See* Baths.
Tiber, inundation of 589, 24–5; of 716, 218; of 791, 385–6.
Tiberius I., Emperor, legends concerning, 198–9.
Tiberius II., 18, 21.
Tiberius Apsimar, 192.
Tiberius Petasius, 242.
Tifernum, 365 note.
Titular churches, number under Adrian I., 402 note.
Toto, Dux, 323, 328, 337, 450.
Towers of churches, 317–8.
Trajan, legends concerning, 81–3.
Trasamund II., Duke, 241; cedes Gallese to the Pope, 250; flies to Rome, 250; re-enters Spoleto, 251; declared a rebel, 258; takes the cowl, 259.
Tres Falciclas, 385.
Tabernae, Bishopric, 458 and note.
Tria Fata, 121.
Tribunes, 330, 422, 441, 452.
Tributales, 391.
Triclinium. *See* Lateran.
Turpin of Rheims, 332.
Tuscany, Roman, 366, 454.
Typus, 145.

Ulfilas, Codex of, 87 note.
Umbria, 461.
Uncia, 395 note.
Unction, ceremony of, 505 note.
Utriculum, 350 and note.

Valentinian, Abbot, 20.
Valentinus, S., ch., 144 and note.
Vatican, palace, 317–9; monastery, 317.
Velum auri, 170.
Venantius, S., 138.
Venetians, fight against Liutprand, 240; their traffic in slaves, 375; driven from Ravenna, 374.
Veronica, S., handkerchief of, 197–200 and notes, 224.
Vestiarius, 446–7.
Via Appia, 459.
Ardeatina, 394, 457.
Aurelia, 454.
Campana, 455.
Cassia, 454.
Claudia, 454–5.
Collatina, 389.
Flaminia, 454.
Labicana, 456.
Latina, 456.
Merulana, 348 and note.
Nomentana, 461.
Ostiensis, 457.
Sacra, 210.
Salara, 461.
Tiburtina, 461.
Valeria, 461.
Vicarius Romae, 97.
Vice Dominus, 446.
Vicus Alexandri, 60.
Saxonum, 429.
Vigilius, Pope, 86.
Villenage, 391–3.
Vincenzo (Vincent), S., 131.
Vincenzo ed Anastasio, SS., ch., 131.
Vincenzo, S., on Vulturuno, monastery, 276.
Virgil, recited, 84, 85.
Vitalian, Pope, 150, 154–5, 163.
Vivariense, monastery, 12.
Volusian, 198.

Waldipert, presbyter, 327; raises Philip to the Papacy, 328–9; death of, 331.
Walls, restored by Gregory II., 218; by Gregory, III., 248, 292; by Adrian I., 386, 397.
Warnefried. *See* Paulus Diaconus.
Werner, Abbot, 292, 293.
Winichis, Duke, 484.
Wirundus, 484.
Wolf, Capitoline, 125–6 and note.
Wulfrin, 378.

Xenodochium, 429.

Zacharias, Pope, 257; makes treaty with Liutprand, 258; journeys to him, 259; makes peace between him and the Exarchate, 261; acquires Norma and Nympha, 263; overcomes Rachis, 266; acknowledges Pipin, 269; his death, 269; buildings, 270–2; *Domus cultae*, 272–4; privilegium of, 7 note.
Zacharias, Presbyter, 466.
Zacharias, Protospather, 182–3.
Zoto, Duke, 20, 152.

PRINTED BY NEILL AND CO., LTD., EDINBURGH.

Property of
WILLIAM and FLORA RICHARDSON
LIBRARY